

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. VI. *New Series.* NOVEMBER 1861.

PART XVI.

DÖLLINGER ON THE TEMPORAL POWER.*

AFTER half a year's delay, Dr. Döllinger has redeemed his promise to publish the text of those lectures which made so profound a sensation in the Catholic world. We are sorry to find that the report which fell into our hands at the time, and from which we gave the account that appeared in our May Number, was both defective and incorrect; and we should further regret that we did not follow the example of those journals which abstained from comment so long as no authentic copy was accessible, if it did not appear that, although the argument of the lecturer was lost, his meaning was not, on the whole, seriously misrepresented. Excepting for the sake of the author, who became the object, and of those who unfortunately made themselves the organs, of so much calumny, it is impossible to lament the existence of the erroneous statements which have caused the present publication. Intending at first to prefix an introduction to the text of his lectures, the professor has been led on by the gravity of the occasion, the extent of his subject, and the abundance of materials, to compose a book of 700 pages. Written with all the author's perspicuity of style, though without his usual compression; with the exhaustless information which never fails him, but with an economy of quotation suited to the general public for whom it is designed, it betrays the circumstances of its origin. Subjects are sometimes introduced out of their proper place and order; and there are

* Kirche und Kirchen; Papstthum und Kirchenstaat (The Church and the Churches; the Papacy and the Papal States: a historical and political survey). By J. v. Döllinger. Munich, 1861.

occasional repetitions, which show that he had not at starting fixed the proportions of the different parts of his work. This does not, however, affect the logical sequence of the ideas, or the accuracy of the induction. No other book contains—no other writer probably could supply—so comprehensive and so suggestive a description of the state of the Protestant religion, or so impartial an account of the causes which have brought on the crisis of the temporal power.

The *Symbolik* of Möhler was suggested by the beginning of that movement of revival and resuscitation amongst the Protestants, of which Döllinger now surveys the fortunes and the result.* The interval of thirty years has greatly altered the position of the Catholic divines towards their antagonists. Möhler had to deal with the ideas of the Reformation, the works of the Reformers, and the teaching of the confessions; he had to answer in the nineteenth century the theology of the sixteenth. The Protestantism for which he wrote was a complete system, antagonistic to the whole of Catholic theology, and he confuted the one by comparing it with the other, dogma for dogma. But that of which Döllinger treats has lost, for the most part, those distinctive doctrines, not by the growth of unbelief, but in consequence of the very efforts which its most zealous and religious professors have made to defend and to redeem it. The contradictions and errors of the Protestant belief were formerly the subject of controversy with its Catholic opponents; but now the controversy is anticipated and prevented by the undisguised admissions of its desponding friends. It stands no longer as a system consistent, complete, satisfying the judgment and commanding the unconditional allegiance of its followers, and fortified at all points against Catholicism; but disorganised as a Church, its doctrines in a state of dissolution, despaired of by its divines, strong and compact only in its hostility to Rome, but with no positive principle of unity, no ground of resistance, nothing to have faith in, but the determination to reject authority. This, therefore, is the point which Döllinger takes up. Reducing the chief phenomena of religious and social decline to the one head of failing authority, he founds on the state of Protestantism the apology of the Papacy. He abandons to the Protestant theology the destruction of the Protestant Church, and leaves its divines to confute and abjure its principles in detail, and to arrive by the exhaustion of the modes of error, through a painful but honourable process, at the gates of truth; he meets their arguments simply by a chapter of

* See the preface to the first edition of the *Symbolik*.

ecclesiastical history, of which experience teaches them the force ; and he opposes to their theories, not the discussions of controversial theology, but the character of a single institution. The opportunity he has taken to do this, the assumed coincidence between the process of dissolution among the Protestants and the process of regeneration in the court of Rome, is the characteristic peculiarity of the book. Before we proceed to give an analysis of its contents, we will give some extracts from the Preface, which explains the purpose of the whole, and which is alone one of the most important contributions to the religious discussions of the day.

“This book arose from two out of four lectures which were delivered in April this year. How I came to discuss the most difficult and complicated question of our time before a very mixed audience, and in a manner widely different from that usually adopted, I deem myself bound to explain. It was my intention, when I was first requested to lecture, only to speak of the present state of religion in general, with a comprehensive view extending over all mankind. It happened, however, that from those circles which had given the impulse to the lectures, the question was frequently put to me, how the position of the Holy See, the partly consummated, partly threatening, loss of its secular power is to be explained. What answer, I was repeatedly asked, is to be given to those out of the Church who point with triumphant scorn to the numerous episcopal manifestoes, in which the states of the Church are declared essential and necessary to her existence, although the events of the last thirty years appear with increasing distinctness to announce their downfall ? I had found the hope often expressed in newspapers, books, and periodicals, that after the destruction of the temporal power of the Popes, the Church herself would not escape dissolution. At the same time, I was struck by finding in the memoirs of Chateaubriand that Cardinal Bernetti, secretary of state to Leo XII., had said, that if he lived long, there was a chance of his beholding the fall of the temporal power of the Papacy. I had also read, in the letter of a well-informed and trustworthy correspondent from Paris, that the Archbishop of Rheims had related on his return from Rome that Pius IX. had said to him, ‘ I am under no illusions, the temporal power must fall. Goyon will abandon me ; I shall then disband my remaining troops. I shall excommunicate the king when he enters the city ; and shall calmly await my death.’

I thought already, in April, that I could perceive, what has become still more clear in October, that the enemies of the secular power of the Papacy are determined, united, predominant, and that there is nowhere a protecting power which possesses the will, and at the same time the means, of averting the catastrophe. I considered it, therefore, probable that an interruption of the temporal dominion would soon ensue,—an interruption which, like others

before it, would also come to an end, and would be followed by a restoration. I resolved, therefore, to take the opportunity, which the lectures gave me, to prepare the public for the coming events, which already cast their shadows upon us, and thus to prevent the scandals, the doubt, and the offence which must inevitably arise if the States of the Church should pass into other hands, although the pastorals of the Bishops had so energetically asserted that they belonged to the integrity of the Church. I meant, therefore, to say, the Church by her nature can very well exist, and did exist for seven centuries, without the territorial possessions of the Popes; afterwards this possession became necessary, and, in spite of great changes and vicissitudes, has discharged in most cases its function of serving as a foundation for the independence and freedom of the Popes. As long as the present state and arrangement of Europe endures, we can discover no other means to secure to the Holy See its freedom, and with it the confidence of all. But the knowledge and the power of God reach farther than ours, and we must not presume to set bounds to the Divine wisdom and omnipotence, or to say to it, In this way and in no other! Should, nevertheless, the threatening consummation ensue, and should the Pope be robbed of his land, one of three eventualities will assuredly come to pass. Either the loss of the state is only temporary, and the territory will revert, after some intervening casualties, either whole or in part, to its legitimate sovereign, or Providence will bring about, by ways unknown to us, and combinations which we cannot divine, a state of things in which the object, namely, the independence and free action of the Holy See, will be attained without the means which have hitherto served; or else we are approaching great catastrophes in Europe, the doom of the whole edifice of the present social order, —events of which the ruin of the Roman State is only the precursor and the herald.

The reasons for which, of these three possibilities, I think the first the most probable, I have developed in this book. Concerning the second alternative, there is nothing to be said; it is an unknown, and therefore indescribable quantity. Only we must retain it against certain over-confident assertions which profess to know the secret things to come, and, trespassing on the divine domain, wish to subject the Future absolutely to the laws of the immediate Past. That the third possibility must also be admitted, few of those who studiously observe the signs of the time will dispute. One of the ablest historians and statesmen—Niebuhr—wrote on the 5th October 1830: ‘If God does not miraculously aid, a destruction is in store for us such as the Roman world underwent in the middle of the third century—destruction of prosperity, of freedom, of civilisation, and of literature.’ And we have proceeded much farther on the inclined plane since then. The European Powers have overturned, or have allowed to be overturned, the two pillars of their existence,—the principle of legitimacy, and the public law of nations. Those monarchs who have made themselves the slaves of the Revo-

lution, to do its work, are the active agents in the historical drama ; the others stand aside as quiet spectators, in expectation of inheriting something, like Prussia and Russia, or bestowing encouragement and assistance, like England, or as passive invalids, like Austria and the sinking empire of Turkey. But the Revolution is a permanent chronic disease, breaking out now in one place, now in another, sometimes seizing several members together. The Pentarchy is dissolved ; the Holy Alliance, which, however defective or open to abuse, was one form of political order, is buried : the right of might prevails in Europe. Is it a process of renovation or a process of dissolution in which European society is plunged ? I still think the former ; but I must, as I have said, admit the possibility of the other alternative. If it occurs, then, when the powers of destruction have done their work, it will be the business of the Church at once to coöperate actively in the reconstruction of social order out of the ruins, both as a connecting civilising power, and as the preserver and dispenser of moral and religious tradition. And thus the Papacy, with or without territory, has its own function and its appointed mission.

These, then, were the ideas from which I started ; and it may be supposed that my language concerning the immediate fate of the temporal power of the Pope necessarily sounded ambiguous, that I could not well come with the confidence which is given to other—perhaps more far-sighted—men before my audience, and say, Rely upon it, the States of the Church—the land from Radicofani to Ceperano, from Ravenna to Cività Vecchia, shall and must and will invariably remain to the Popes. Heaven and earth shall pass away before the Roman State shall pass away. I could not do this, because I did not at that time believe it, nor do I now ; but am only confident that the Holy See will not be permanently deprived of the conditions necessary for the fulfilment of its mission. Thus the substance of my words was this : Let no one lose faith in the Church if the secular principality of the Pope should disappear for a season, or for ever. It is not essence, but accident ; not end, but means ; it began late ; it was formerly something quite different from what it is now. It justly appears to us indispensable ; and as long as the existing order lasts in Europe, it must be maintained at any price ; or if it is violently interrupted, it must be restored. But a political settlement of Europe is conceivable in which it would be superfluous, and then it would be an oppressive burden. At the same time I wished to defend Pope Pius IX. and his government against many accusations, and to point out that the inward infirmities and deficiencies which undeniably exist in the country, by which the state has been reduced to so deplorable a condition of weakness and helplessness, are not attributable to him ; that, on the contrary, he has shown, both before and since 1848, the best will to reform ; and that by him, and under him, much has been really improved.

The newspaper reports, written down at home from memory, gave but an inaccurate representation of a discourse which did not

attempt in the usual way to cut the knot, but which, with *buts* and *ifs*, and referring to certain elements in the decision which are generally left out of the calculation, spoke of an uncertain future, and of various possibilities. This was not to be avoided. Any reproduction which was not quite literal must, in spite of the good intentions of the reporter, have given rise to false interpretations. When, therefore, one of the most widely-read papers reported the first lecture, without any intentional falsification, but with omissions which altered the sense and the tendency of my words, I immediately proposed to the conductors to print my manuscript; but this offer was declined. In other accounts in the daily press, I was often unable to recognise my ideas; and words were put into my mouth which I had never uttered. And here I will admit that, when I gave the lectures, I did not think that they would be discussed by the press, but expected that, like others of the same kind, they would at most be mentioned in a couple of words, *in futuram oblivionem*. Of the controversy which sprang up at once, in separate works and in newspaper articles, in Germany, France, England, Italy, and even in America, I shall not speak. Much of it I have not read. The writers often did not even ask themselves whether the report which accident put into their hands, and which they carelessly adopted, was at all accurate. But I must refer to an account in one of the most popular English periodicals, because I am there brought into a society to which I do not belong. The author of an article in the July number of the *Edinburgh Review* appeals to me, misunderstanding the drift of my words, and erroneously believing that I had already published an apology of my orthodoxy. . . . A sharp attack upon me in the *Dublin Review* I know only from extracts in English papers; but I can see from the vehemence with which the writer pronounces himself against liberal institutions, that, even after the appearance of this book, I cannot reckon on coming to an understanding with him.

The excitement which was caused by my lectures, or rather by the accounts of them in the papers, had this advantage, that it brought to light, in a way which to many was unexpected, how widely, how deeply, and how firmly the attachment of the people to the See of St. Peter is rooted. For the sake of this I was glad to accept all the attacks and animosity which fell on me in consequence. But why, it will be asked, and I have been asked innumerable times,—why not cut short misunderstandings by the immediate publication of the lectures, which must, as a whole, have been written beforehand? why wait for five months? For this I had two reasons: first, it was not merely a question of misunderstanding. Much of what I had actually said had made an unpleasant impression in many quarters, especially among our optimists. I should, therefore, with my bare statements, have become involved in an agitating discussion in pamphlets and newspapers, and that was not an attractive prospect. The second reason was this: I expected that the further progress of events in Italy, the irresistible logic of facts, would dispose minds

to receive certain truths. I hoped that people would learn by degrees, in the school of events, that it is not enough always to be reckoning with the figures, 'revolution,' 'secret societies,' 'Mazzinism,' 'Atheism,' or to estimate things only by the standard supplied by the 'Jew of Verona,' but that other factors must be admitted into the calculation; for instance, the condition of the Italian clergy, and its position towards the laity. I wished, therefore, to let a few months go by, before I came before the public. Whether I judged rightly, the reception of this book will show.

I thoroughly understand those who think it censurable that I should have spoken in detail of situations and facts which are gladly ignored, or touched with a light and hasty hand, and that especially at the present crisis. I myself was restrained for ten years by these considerations, in spite of the feeling which urged me to speak on the question of the Roman government, and it required the circumstances I have described, I may almost say, to compel me to speak publicly on the subject. I beg of these persons to weigh the following points. First, when an author openly exposes a state of things already abundantly discussed in the press, if he draws away the necessarily very transparent covering from the gaping wounds which are not on the Church herself, but on an institution nearly connected with her, and whose infirmities she is made to feel, it may fairly be supposed that he does it, in agreement with the example of earlier friends and great men of the Church, only to show the possibility and the necessity of the cure, in order, so far as in him lies, to weaken the reproach that the defenders of the Church see only the mote in the eyes of others, not the beam in their own, and with narrow-hearted prejudice endeavour to soften, or to dissimulate, or to deny every fact which is or which appears unfavourable to their cause. He does it in order that it may be understood that where the powerlessness of men to effect a cure becomes manifest, God interposes in order to sift on His threshing-floor the chaff from the wheat, and to consume it with the fire of the catastrophes which are only His judgments and remedies. Secondly, I could not, as a historian, present the effects without going back to their causes; and it was therefore my duty, as it is that of every religious inquirer and observer, to try to contribute something to the *Theodicea*. He that undertakes to write on such lofty interests, which nearly affect the weal and woe of the Church, cannot avoid examining and displaying the wisdom and justice of God in the conduct of terrestrial events regarding them. The fate which has overtaken the Roman States must above all be considered in the light of a Divine ordinance for the advantage of the Church. Seen by that light, it assumes the character of a trial, which will continue until the object is attained, and the welfare of the Church so far secured.

It seemed evident to me, that as a new order of things in Europe lies in the design of Providence, the disease, through which for the last half-century the States of the Church unquestionably have passed, might be the transition to a new form. To describe this

malady without overlooking or concealing any of the symptoms was therefore an undertaking which I could not avoid. The disease has its source in the inward contradiction and discord of the institutions and conditions of the government ; for the modern French institutions stand there, without any reconciling qualifications, beside those of the medieval hierarchy. Neither of these elements is strong enough to expel the other ; and either of them would, if it prevailed alone, be again a form of disease. Yet, in the history of the last few years I recognise symptoms of convalescence, however feeble, obscure, and equivocal its traces may appear. What we behold is not death or hopeless decay ; it is a purifying process, painful, consuming, penetrating bone and marrow,—such as God inflicts on His chosen persons and institutions. There is abundance of dross, and time is necessary before the gold can come pure out of the furnace. In the course of this process it may happen that the territorial dominion will be interrupted, that the state may be broken up or pass into other hands ; but it will revive, though perhaps in another form, and with a different kind of government. In a word, *sanabimur laboramus malis* ; that is what I wished to show ; that, I believe, I have shown. Now, and for the last forty years, the condition of the Roman States is the heel of Achilles of the Catholic Church, the standing reproach for adversaries throughout the world, and a stumbling-block for thousands. Not as though the objections, which are founded on the fact of this transitory disturbance and discord in the social and political sphere, possessed any weight in a theological point of view : but it cannot be denied that they are of incalculable influence on the disposition of the world external to the Church.

Whenever a state of disease has appeared in the Church, there has been but one method of cure,—that of an awakened, renovated, healthy consciousness and of an enlightened public opinion in the Church. The good will of the ecclesiastical rulers and heads has not been able to accomplish the cure, unless sustained by the general sense and conviction of the clergy and of the laity. The healing of the great malady of the sixteenth century, the true internal reformation of the Church, only became possible when people ceased to disguise or to deny the evil, and to pass it by with silence and concealment,—when so powerful and irresistible a public opinion had formed itself in the Church, that its commanding influence could no longer be evaded. At the present day, what we want is the whole truth, not merely the perception that the temporal power of the Pope is required by the Church,—for that is obvious to every body, at least out of Italy, and every thing has been said that can be said about it ; but also the knowledge of the conditions under which this power is possible for the future. The history of the Popes is full of instances where their best intentions were not fulfilled, and their strongest resolutions broke down, because the interests of a firmly compacted class resisted like an impenetrable hedge of thorns. Hadrian VI. was fully resolved to set about the reformation in earnest ; and yet he achieved virtually nothing, and felt himself, though in possession

of supreme power, altogether powerless against the passive resistance of all those who should have been his instruments in the work. Only when public opinion, even in Italy, and in Rome itself, was awakened, purified, and strengthened; when the cry for reform resounded imperatively on every side,—then only was it possible for the Popes to overcome the resistance in the inferior spheres, and, gradually and step by step, to open the way for a more healthy state. May, therefore, a powerful, healthy, unanimous public opinion in Catholic Europe come to the aid of Pius IX. !

Concerning another part of this book I have a few words to say. I have given a survey of all the Churches and ecclesiastical communities now existing. The obligation of attempting this presented itself to me, because I had to explain both the universal importance of the Papacy as a power for all the world, and the things which it actually performs. This could not be done fully without exhibiting the internal condition of the Churches which have rejected it, and withdrawn from its influence. It is true that the plan increased under my hands, and I endeavoured to give as clear a picture as possible of the development which has accomplished itself in the separated Churches since the Reformation, and through it, in consequence of the views and principles which had been once for all adopted. I have, therefore, admitted into my description no feature which is not, in my opinion, an effect, a result, however remote, of those principles and doctrines. There is doubtless room for discussion in detail upon this point, and there will unavoidably be a decided opposition to this book, if it should be noticed beyond the limits of the Church to which I belong. I hope that there also the justice will be done me of believing that I was far from having any intention of offending; that I have only said what must be said, if we would go to the bottom of these questions; that I had to do with institutions which, because of the dogmas and principles from which they spring, must, like a tree that is nailed to a wall, remain in one position, however unnatural it may be. I am quite ready to admit that, on the opposite side, the men are often better than the system to which they are, or deem themselves, attached; and that, on the contrary, in the Church the individuals are, on the average, inferior in theory and in practice to the system under which they live.

The union of the two Religions, which would be socially and politically the salvation of Germany and of Europe, is not possible at present; first, because the greater, more active, and more influential portion of the German Protestants do not desire it, for political or religious reasons, in any form or under any practicable conditions. It is impossible, secondly, because negotiations concerning the mode and the conditions of union can no longer be carried on. For this, plenipotentiaries on both sides are required; and these only the Catholic Church is able to appoint, by virtue of her ecclesiastical organisation, not the Protestants. Nevertheless, theologically, Protestants and Catholics have come nearer each other; for those capital doctrines, those articles with

which the Church was to stand or fall, for the sake of which the Reformers declared separation from the Catholic Church to be necessary, are now confuted and given up by Protestant theology, or are retained only nominally, whilst other notions are connected with the words. Protestant theology is at the present day less hostile, so to speak, than the theologians. For whilst theology has levelled the strongest bulwarks and doctrinal barriers which the Reformation had set up to confirm the separation, the divines, instead of viewing favourably the consequent facilities for union, often labour, on the contrary, to conceal the fact, or to provide new points of difference. Many of them probably agree with Stahl of Berlin, who said, shortly before his death, 'Far from supposing that the breach of the sixteenth century can be healed, we ought, if it had not already occurred, to make it now.' This, however, will not continue; and a future generation, perhaps that which is even now growing up, will rather adopt the recent declaration of Heinrich Leo, 'In the Roman Catholic Church a process of purification has taken place since Luther's day; and if the Church had been in the days of Luther what the Roman Catholic Church in Germany actually is at present, it would never have occurred to him to assert his opposition so energetically as to bring about a separation.' Those who think thus will then be the right men and the chosen instruments for the acceptable work of the reconciliation of the Churches, and the true unity of Germany. Upon the day when, on both sides, the conviction shall arise vivid and strong, that Christ really desires the unity of His Church, that the division of Christendom, the multiplicity of Churches, is displeasing to God, that he who helps to prolong this situation must answer for it to the Lord,—on that day four-fifths of the traditional polemics of the Protestants against the Church will with one blow be set aside, like chaff and rubbish; for four-fifths consist of misunderstandings, logomachies, and wilful falsifications, or relate to personal, and therefore accidental, things, which are utterly insignificant where only principles and dogmas are at stake.

On that day, also, much will be changed on the Catholic side. Thenceforward the character of Luther and the Reformers will no more be dragged forward in the pulpit. The clergy, mindful of the saying, *Interfice errores, diligite homines*, will always conduct themselves towards members of other Churches in conformity with the rules of charity, and will therefore assume, in all cases where there are no clear proofs to the contrary, the *bona fides* of opponents. They will never forget that no man is convinced and won over by bitter words and violent attacks, but that every one is rather repelled by them. Warned by the words of the Epistle to the Romans (xiv. 13), they will be more careful than heretofore to give to their separated brethren no scandal, no grounds of accusation against the Church. Accordingly, in popular instruction and in religious life, they will always make the great truths of salvation the centre of all their teaching: they will not treat secondary things in life and doc-

trine as though they were of the first importance ; but, on the contrary, they will keep alive in the people the consciousness that such things are but means to an end, and are only of inferior consequence and subsidiary value.

Until that day shall dawn upon Germany, it is our duty as Catholics, in the words of Cardinal Diepenbrock, 'to bear the religious separation in a spirit of penance for guilt incurred in common.' We must acknowledge that here also God has caused much good as well as much evil to proceed from the errors of men, from the contests and passions of the sixteenth century ; that the anxiety of the German nation to see the intolerable abuses and scandals in the Church removed was fully justified, and sprang from the better qualities of our people, and from their moral indignation at the desecration and corruption of holy things, which were degraded to selfish and hypocritical purposes. We do not refuse to admit that the great separation, and the storms and sufferings connected with it, was an awful judgment upon Catholic Christendom, which clergy and laity had but too well deserved,—a judgment which has had an improving and salutary effect. The great conflict of intellects has purified the European atmosphere, has impelled the human mind on to new courses, and has promoted a rich scientific and literary life. Protestant theology, with its restless spirit of inquiry, has gone along by the side of the Catholic, exciting and awakening, warning and vivifying ; and every eminent Catholic divine in Germany will gladly admit that he owes much to the writings of Protestant scholars.

We must also acknowledge that in the Church the rust of abuses, and of a mechanical superstition, is always forming afresh ; that the spiritual in religion is sometimes materialised, and therefore degraded, deformed, and applied to their own loss, by the servants of the Church, through their indolence and want of intelligence, and by the people, through their ignorance. The true spirit of reform must therefore never depart from the Church, but must periodically break out with renovating strength, and penetrate the mind and the will of the clergy. In this sense we do not refuse to admit the justice of a call to penance, when it proceeds from those who are not of us,—that is, of a warning carefully to examine our religious life and pastoral conduct, and to remedy what is found defective.

At the same time it must not be forgotten that the separation did not ensue in consequence of the abuses of the Church. For the duty and necessity of removing these abuses has always been recognised ; and only the difficulty of the thing, the not always unjustifiable fear lest the wheat should be pulled up with the tares, prevented for a time the Reformation, which was accomplished in the Church and through her. Separation on account merely of abuses in ecclesiastical life, when the doctrine is the same, is rejected as criminal by the Protestants as well as by us. It is, therefore, for doctrine's sake that the separation occurred ; and the general discontent of the people, the weakening of ecclesiastical authority by the existence of

abuses, only facilitated the adoption of the new doctrines. But now on one side some of these defects and evils in the life of the Church have disappeared, the others have greatly diminished since the reforming movement; and on the other side, the principal doctrines for which they separated, and on the truth of which, and their necessity for salvation, the right and duty of secession was based, are given up by Protestant science, deprived of their Scriptural basis by exegesis, or at least made very uncertain by the opposition of the most eminent Protestant divines. Meanwhile we live in hopes, comforting ourselves with the conviction that history, or that process of development in Europe which is being accomplished before our eyes, as well in society and politics as in religion, is the powerful ally of the friends of ecclesiastical union; and we hold out our hands to Christians on the other side for a combined war of resistance against the destructive movements of the age."

There are two circumstances which make us fear that the work will not be received in the spirit in which it is written, and that its object will not immediately be attained. The first of these is the extraordinary effect which was produced by the declaration which the author made on the occasion of the late assembly of the Catholic associations of Germany at Munich. He stated simply, what is understood by every Catholic out of Italy, and intelligible to every reasonable Protestant, that the freedom of the Church imperatively requires that, in order to protect the Pope from the perils which menace him, particularly in our age, he should possess a sovereignty not merely nominal, and that his right to his dominions is as good as that of all other legitimate sovereigns. In point of fact, this expression of opinion, which occurs even in the garbled reports of the lectures, leaves all those questions on which it is possible for serious and dispassionate men to be divided entirely open. It does not determine whether there was any excuse for the disaffection of the Papal subjects; whether the security afforded by a more extensive dominion is greater than the increased difficulty of administration under the conditions inherited from the French occupation; whether an organised system of tribute or domains might be sufficient, in conjunction with a more restricted territory; whether the actual loss of power is or is not likely to prove a misfortune for religion. The storm of applause with which these words, simply expressing that in which all agree, were received, must have suggested to the speaker that his countrymen in general are unprepared to believe that one, who has no other aspiration in his life and his works than the advancement of the Catholic religion, can speak without a reverent awe of the temporal government,

or can witness without dismay its impending fall. They must have persuaded themselves that not only the details, but the substance of his lectures had been entirely misreported, and that his views were as free from novelty as destitute of offence. It is hard to believe that such persons will be able to reconcile themselves to the fearless and straightforward spirit in which the first of Church historians discusses the history of his own age.

Another consideration, almost equally significant with the attitude of the great mass of Catholics, is the silence of the minority who agree with Döllinger. Those earnest Catholics who, in their Italian patriotism, insist on the possibility of reconciling the liberty of the Holy See with the establishment of an ideal unity, Passaglia, Tosti, the followers of Gioberti, and the disciples of Rosmini, have not hesitated to utter openly their honest but most inconceivable persuasion. But on the German side of the Alps, where no political agitation affects the religious judgment, or drives men into disputes, those eminent thinkers who agree with Döllinger are withheld by various considerations from publishing their views. Sometimes it is the hopelessness of making an impression, sometimes the grave inconvenience of withstanding the current of opinion, that makes them keep silence; and their silence leaves those who habitually follow them not only without means of expressing their views, but often without decided views to express. The same influences which deprive Döllinger of the open support of these natural allies, will impede the success of his work, until events have outstripped ideas, and until men awake to the discovery that what they refused to anticipate or to prepare for, is already accomplished.

Piety sometimes gives birth to scruples, and faith to superstition, when they are not directed by wisdom and knowledge. One source of the difficulty of which we are speaking, is as much a defect of faith as a defect of knowledge. Just as it is difficult for some Catholics to believe that the supreme spiritual authority on earth could ever be in unworthy hands, so they find it hard to reconcile the reverence due to the Vicar of Christ, and the promises made to him, with the acknowledgment of intolerable abuses in his temporal administration. It is a comfort to make the best of the case, to draw conclusions from the exaggerations, the inventions, and the malice of the accusers against the justice of the accusation, and in favour of the accused. It is a temptation to our weakness and to our consciences to defend the Pope as we would defend ourselves—with the same care and zeal, with the same uneasy secret consciousness that

there are weak points in the case which can best be concealed by diverting attention from them. What the defence gains in energy, it loses in sincerity; the cause of the Church, which is the cause of truth, is mixed up and confused with human elements, and is injured by a degrading alliance. In this way even piety may lead to immorality, and devotion to the Pope may lead away from God.

The position of perpetual antagonism to a spirit which we abhor; the knowledge that the clamour against the temporal power is in very many instances inspired by hatred of the spiritual authority; the indignation at the impure motives mixed up with the movement,—all these things easily blind Catholics to the fact that our attachment to the Pope as our spiritual Head, our notion that his civil sovereignty is a safeguard of his freedom, are the real motives of our disposition to deny the truth of the accusations made against his government. It is hard to believe that imputations which take the form of insults, and which strike at the Church through the State, are well founded, and to distinguish the design and the occasion from the facts. It is, perhaps, more than we can expect of men, that, after defending the Pope as a sovereign because he is a pontiff, and adopting against his enemies the policy of unconditional defence, they will consent to adopt a view which corroborates to a great extent the assertions they have combated, and implicitly condemns their tactics. It is natural to oppose one extreme by another; and those who avoid both easily appear to be capitulating with error. The effects of this spirit of opposition are not confined to those who are engaged in resisting the No-popery party in England, or the revolution in Italy. The fate of the temporal power hangs neither on the Italian ministry nor on English influence, but on the decision of the Emperor of the French; and the loudest maintainers of the rights of the Holy See are among that party who have been the most zealous adversaries of the imperial system. The French Catholics behold in the Roman policy of the Emperor a scheme for obtaining over the Church a power of which they would be the first victims. Their religious freedom is in jeopardy while he has the fate of the Pope in his hands. That which is elsewhere simply a manifestation of opinion and a moral influence, is in France an active interference and a political power. They alone among Catholic subjects can bring a pressure to bear on him who has had the initiative in the Italian movement. They fear by silence to incur a responsibility for criminal acts. For them it is a season for action, and the time has not yet come when they can

speaking with judicial impartiality, or with the freedom of history, or determine how far, in the pursuit of his ambitious ends, Napoleon III. is the instrument of Providence, or how far, without any merit of his own, he is likely to fulfil the expectations of those who see in him a new Constantine. Whilst they maintain this unequal war, they naturally identify the rights of the Church with her interests; and the wrongs of the Pope are before their eyes so as to eclipse the realities of the Roman government. The most vehement and one-sided of those who have dwelt exclusively on the crimes of the Revolution and the justice of the Papal cause, the Bishop of Orleans for instance, or Count de Montalembert, might without inconsistency, and doubtless would without hesitation, subscribe to almost every word in Döllinger's work; but in the position they have taken, they would probably deem such adhesion a great rhetorical error, and fatal to the effect of their own writings. There is, therefore, an allowance to be made, which is by no means a reproach, for the peculiar situation of the Catholics in France.

When Christine of Sweden was observed to gaze long and intently at the statue of Truth in Rome, a court-like prelate observed that this admiration for Truth did her honour, as it was seldom shared by persons in her station. "That," said the Queen, "is because truths are not all made of marble." Men are seldom zealous for an idea in which they do not perceive some reflection of themselves, in which they have not embarked some portion of their individuality, or which they cannot connect with some subjective purpose of their own. It is often more easy to sympathise with a person in whose opposite views we discern a weakness corresponding to our own, than with one who unsympathetically avoids to colour the objectivity of truth, and is guided in his judgment by facts, not by wishes. We endeavoured, not many months ago, to show how remote the theology of Catholic Germany is in its scientific spirit from that of other countries, and how far asunder are science and policy. The same method applied to the events of our own day, must be yet more startling, and for a time we can scarcely anticipate that the author of this work will escape an apparent isolation between the reserve of those who share his views, but are not free to speak, and the foregone conclusions of most of those who have already spoken. But a book which treats of contemporary events in accordance with the signs of the time, not with the aspirations of men, possesses in time itself an invincible auxiliary. When the lesson which this great writer draws from the example of the medieval Popes

has borne its fruit; when the purpose for which he has written is attained, and the freedom of the Holy See from revolutionary aggression and arbitrary protection is recovered by the heroic determination to abandon that which in the course of events has ceased to be a basis of independence,—he will be the first, but no longer the only, proclaimer of new ideas, and he will not have written in vain.

The Christian religion, as it addresses and adapts itself to all mankind, bears towards the varieties of national character a relation of which there was no example in the religions of antiquity, and which heresy repudiates and inevitably seeks to destroy. For heresy, like paganism, is national, and dependent both on the particular disposition of the people and on the government of the state. It is identified with definite local conditions, and moulded by national and political peculiarities. Catholicity alone is universal in its character and mission, and independent of those circumstances by which states are established, and nations are distinguished from each other. Even Rome had not so far extended her limits, nor so thoroughly subjugated and amalgamated the races that obeyed her, as to secure the Church from the natural reaction of national spirit against a religion which claimed a universality beyond even that of the imperial power. The first and most terrible assault of ethnicism was in Persia, where Christianity appeared as a Roman, and therefore a foreign and a hostile, system. As the Empire gradually declined, and the nationalities, no longer oppressed beneath a vigorous central force, began to revive, the heresies, by a natural affinity, associated themselves with them. The Donatist schism, in which no other country joined, was an attempt of the African people to establish a separate national Church. Later on, the Egyptians adopted the Monophysite heresy as the national faith, which has survived to this day in the Coptic Church. In Armenia similar causes produced like effects.

In the twelfth century—not, as is commonly supposed, in the time of Photius and Cerularius, for religious communion continued to subsist between the Latins and the Greeks at Constantinople till about the time of Innocent III., but after the Crusades had embittered the antagonism between East and West—another great national separation occurred. In the Eastern empire the communion with Rome was hateful to the two chief authorities. The patriarch was ambitious to extend his own absolute jurisdiction over the whole empire, the emperor wished to increase that power as the instrument of his own; out of this threefold combination of interests

sprang the Byzantine system. It was founded on the ecclesiastical as well as civil despotism of the emperor, and on the exclusive pride of the people in its nationality; that is, on those things which are most essentially opposed to the Catholic spirit, and to the nature of a universal Church. In consequence of the schism, the sovereign became supreme over the canons of the Church and the laws of the State; and to this imperial papacy the Archbishop of Thessalonica, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, justly attributes the ruin and degradation of the Empire. Like the Eastern schism, the schism of the West in the fourteenth century arose from the predominance of national interests in the Church: it proceeded from the endeavour to convert the Holy See into a possession of the French people and a subject of the French crown. Again, not long after, the Hussite revolution sprang from the union of a new doctrine with the old antipathy of the Bohemians for the Germans, which had begun in times when the boundaries of Christianity ran between the two nations, and which led to a strictly national separation, which has not yet exhausted its political effects.

Though the Reformation had not its origin in national feelings, yet they became a powerful instrument in the hands of Luther, and ultimately prevailed over the purely theological elements of the movement. The Lutheran system was looked on by the Germans with patriotic pride as the native fruit and especial achievement of the genius of their country, and it was adopted out of Germany only by the kindred races of Scandinavia. In every other land to which it has been transplanted by the migrations of this century, Lutheranism appears as eradicated from its congenial soil, loses gradually its distinctive features, and becomes assimilated to the more consolatory system of Geneva. Calvinism exhibited from the first no traces of the influence of national character, and to this it owes its greater extension; whilst in the third form of Protestantism, the Anglican Church, nationality is the predominant characteristic. In whatever country and in whatever form Protestantism has prevailed, it has always carried out the principle of separation and local limitation, by seeking to subject itself to the civil power, and to confine the Church within the jurisdiction of the State. It is dependent not so much on national character as on political authority, and has grafted itself rather on the State than on the people. But the institution which Christ founded in order to collect all nations together in one fold under one shepherd, while tolerating and respecting the natural historical distinctions of nations and of States, endeavours to reconcile antagonism, and

to smooth away barriers between them, instead of estranging them by artificial differences, and erecting new obstacles to their harmony. The Church can neither submit as a whole to the influence of a particular people, nor impose on one the features or the habits of another; for she is exalted in her catholicity above the differences of race, and above the claims of political power. At once the most firm and the most flexible institution in the world, she is all things to all nations, —educating each in her own spirit, without violence to its nature, and assimilating it to herself without prejudice to the originality of its native character. Whilst she thus transforms them, not by reducing them to a uniform type, but by raising them towards a common elevation, she receives from them services in return. Each healthy and vigorous nation that is converted is a dynamic as well as a numerical increase in the resources of the Church, by bringing an accession of new and peculiar qualities, as well as of quantity and numbers. So far from seeking sameness, or flourishing only in one atmosphere, she is enriched and strengthened by all the varieties of national character and intellect. In the mission of the Catholic Church, each nation has its function, which its own position and nature indicate and enable it to fulfil. Thus the extinct nations of antiquity survive in the beneficial action they continue to exert within her, and she still feels and acknowledges the influence of the African or of the Cappadocian mind.

The condition of this immunity from the predominant influence of national and political divisions, and of this indifference to the attachment of particular states and races,—the security of unity and universality,—consists in the existence of a single, supreme, independent head. The primacy is the bulwark, or rather the corner-stone, of Catholicism, without it, there would be as many Churches as there are nations or states. Not one of those who have denounced the Papacy as a usurpation has ever attempted to show that the condition which its absence necessarily involves is theologically desirable, or that it is the will of God. It remains the most radical and conspicuous distinction between the Catholic Church and the sects. Those who attempt to do without it are compelled to argue that there is no earthly office divinely appointed for the government of the Church, and that nobody has received the mission to conduct ecclesiastical affairs, and to preserve the divine order in religion. The several local Churches may have an earthly ruler, but for the whole Church of Christ there is no such protection. Christ, therefore, is the only head they acknowledge, and they must

necessarily declare separation, isolation, and discord to be a principle and the normal condition of His Church. The rejection of the primacy of St. Peter has driven men on to a slippery course, where all the steps are downwards. The Greeks first proclaimed that they recognised no pope, that each patriarch ruled over a portion of the Church. The Anglicans rejected both pope and patriarch, and admitted no ecclesiastical order higher than the episcopate. Foreign Protestantism refused to tolerate even bishops, or any authority but the parish clergy under the supremacy of the ruler of the land. Then the sects abolished the local jurisdiction of the parish clergy, and retained only preachers. At length the ministry was rejected as an office altogether, and the Quakers made each individual his own prophet, priest, and doctor.

The Papacy, that unique institution, the crown of the Catholic system, exhibits in its history the constant working of that law which is at the foundation of the life of the Church, the law of continuous organic development. It shared the vicissitudes of the Church, and had its part in every thing which influences the course and mode of her existence. In early times it grew in silence and obscurity, its features were rarely and imperfectly distinguishable; but even then the Popes exerted their authority in all directions, and while the wisdom with which it was exercised was often questioned, the right itself was undisputed. So long as the Roman empire upheld in its strong framework and kept together the Church, which was confined mostly within its bounds, and checked with the stern discipline of a uniform law the manifestations of national and local divergence, the interference of the Holy See was less frequently required, and the reins of Church government did not need to be tightly drawn. When a new order of states emerged from the chaos of the great migration, the Papacy, which alone stood erect amid the ruins of the empire, became the centre of a new system and the moderator of a new code. The long contest with the Germanic empire exhausted the political power both of the empire and of the Papacy, and the position of the Holy See, in the midst of a multitude of equal states, became more difficult and more unfavourable. The Popes were forced to rely on the protection of France, their supremacy over the states was at an end, and the resistance of the nations commenced. The schism, the opposition of the general councils, the circumstances which plunged the Holy See into the intrigues of Italian politics, and at last the Reformation, hastened the decline of that extensive social and political power, the echoes and reminiscences of which

occasioned disaster and repulse whenever an attempt was made to exercise it. Ever since the Tridentine age, the Popes have confined themselves more and more exclusively to the religious domain ; and here the Holy See is as powerful and as free at the present day as at any previous period of its history. The perils and the difficulties which surround it arise from temporal concerns,—from the state of Italy, and from the possession of the pontifical dominions.

As the Church advances towards fulness and maturity in her forms, bringing forward her exhaustless resources, and calling into existence a wealth of new elements,—societies, corporations, and institutions,—so is the need more deeply felt for a powerful supreme guide to keep them all in health and harmony, to direct them in their various spheres and in their several ways towards the common ends and purposes of all, and thus to provide against decay, variance, and confusion. Such an office the Primacy alone can discharge, and the importance of the Papacy increases as the organisation of the Church is more complete. One of its most important but most delicate duties, is to act as an independent, impartial, and dispassionate mediator between the churches and the governments of the different states, and between the conflicting claims and contradictory idiosyncrasies of the various nations. Yet, though the Papacy is so obviously an essential part of a Church whose mission is to all mankind, it is the chosen object of attack both to enemies of Catholicism and to discontented Catholics. Serious and learned men complain of its tyranny, and say that it claims universal dominion, and watches for an opportunity of obtaining it ; and yet, in reality, there is no power on earth whose action is restricted by more sacred and irresistible bonds than that of the Holy See. It is only by the closest fidelity to the laws and tradition of the Church that the Popes are able to secure the obedience and the confidence of Catholics. Pius VII., who, by sweeping away the ancient church of France, and depriving thirty-seven protesting Bishops of their sees, committed the most arbitrary act ever done by a Pope, has himself described the rules which guided the exercise of his authority. “The nature and constitution of the Catholic Church impose on the Pope, who is the head of the Church, certain limits which he cannot transgress. . . . The Bishops of Rome have never believed that they could tolerate any alteration in those portions of the discipline which are directly ordained by Jesus Christ, or in those which, by their nature, are connected with dogma, or in those which heretics assail in support of their innovations.” The chief points urged against the ambition of

Rome are the claim of the deposing power, according to the theory that all kinds of power are united in the Church, and the protest against the Peace of Westphalia, the basis of the public law and political order of modern Europe. It is enough to cite one of the many authorities which may be cited in refutation of the first objection. Cardinal Antonelli, prefect of Propaganda, states in his letter to the Irish Bishops, 1791, that "the See of Rome has never taught that faith is not to be kept with those of another religion, or that an oath sworn to kings who are separated from the Catholic communion may be broken, or that the Pope is permitted to touch their temporal rights and possessions." The Bull in which Boniface VIII., set up the theory of the supremacy of the spiritual over the secular power was retracted soon after his death.

The protest of Innocent X. against the Peace of Westphalia is one of the glories of the Papacy. That peace was concluded on an unchristian and tyrannical principle introduced by the Reformation, that the subjects may be compelled to follow the religion of the ruler. This was very different in principle and in effect from the intolerance of the ages of faith, when prince and people were members of one religion, and all were agreed that no other could be permitted in the State. Every heresy that arose in the Middle Ages involved revolutionary consequences, and would inevitably have overthrown State and society, as well as Church, wherever it prevailed. The Albigenses, who provoked the cruel legislation against heretics, and who were exterminated by fire and sword, were the Socialists of those days. They assailed the fundamental institutions of society, marriage, family, and property, and their triumph would have plunged Europe into the barbarism and license of pagan times. The principles of the Waldenses and the Lollards were likewise incompatible with European civilisation. In those days the law relating to religion was the same for all. The Pope as well as the king would have lost his crown if he had fallen into heresy. During a thousand years, from the fall of Rome to the appearance of Luther, no Catholic prince ever made an attempt to introduce a new religion into his dominions, or to abandon the old. But the Reformation taught that this was the supreme duty of princes; whilst Luther declared that in matters of faith the individual is above every authority, and that a child could understand the Scriptures better than Popes or councils, he taught at the same time, with an inconsistency which he never attempted to remove, that it is the duty of the civil power to exterminate Popery, to set up the Gospel, and to suppress every other religion.

The result was a despotism such as the world had never seen. It was worse than the Byzantine system; for there no attempt was made to change the faith of the people. The Protestant princes exercised an ecclesiastical authority more arbitrary than Pope had ever possessed; for the papal authority can only be used to maintain an existing doctrine, whilst theirs was aggressive and wholly unlimited. Possessing the power to command, and to alter in religion, they naturally acquired by degrees a corresponding absolutism in the civil order. The consistories, the office by which the sovereign ruled the Church, were the commencement of bureaucratic centralisation. A great lawyer of those days says, that after the treaties of Westphalia had recognised the territorial supremacy over religion, the business of administration in the German States increased tenfold. Whilst that system remained in its integrity, there could be no peaceful neighbourhood between Catholics and Protestants. From this point of view, the protest of the Pope was entirely justified. So far from having been made in the spirit of the medieval authority, which would have been fatal to the work of the Congress, it was never used by any Catholic prince to invalidate the treaties. They took advantage of the law in their own territories to exercise the *jus reformandi*. It was not possible for them to tolerate a body which still refused to tolerate the Catholic religion by the side of its own, which accordingly eradicated it wherever it had the means, and whose theory made the existence of every religion depend on the power and the will of the sovereign. A system which so resolutely denied that two religions could coexist in the same state put every attempt at mutual toleration out of the question. The Reformation was a great movement against the freedom of conscience,—an effort to subject it to a new authority, the arbitrary initiative of a prince who might differ in religion from all his subjects. The extermination of obstinate Catholics was a matter of course; Melancthon insisted that the Anabaptists should be put to death; and Beza was of opinion that Anti-Trinitarians ought to be executed, even after recantation. But no Lutheran could complain when the secular arm converted him into a Calvinist. “Your conscience is in error,” he would say; “but under the circumstances you are not only justified, but compelled, on my own principles, to act as you do.”*

* So late as 1791 Pius VI. wrote: “Discrimen intercedit inter homines, qui extra gremium Ecclesiæ semper fuerunt, quales sunt Infideles atque Judæi,

The resistance of the Catholic governments to the progress of a religion which announced that it would destroy them as soon as it had the power, was an instinct of self-preservation. No Protestant divine denied or disguised the truth that his party sought the destruction of Catholicism, and would accomplish it whenever they could. The Calvinists, with their usual fearless consistency, held that as civil and ecclesiastical power must be in the same hands, no prince had any right to govern who did not belong to them. Even in the Low Countries, where other sects were free, and the notion of unity abandoned, the Catholics were oppressed.

This new and aggressive intolerance infected even Catholic countries, where there was neither, as in Spain, religious unity to be preserved, nor, as in Austria, a menacing danger to be resisted. For in Spain the persecution of the Protestants might be defended on the medieval principle of unity, whilst under Ferdinand II. it was provoked in the hereditary dominions by the imminent peril which threatened to dethrone the monarch, and to ruin every faithful Catholic. But in France the Protestant doctrine that every good subject must follow the religion of his king grew out of the intensity of personal absolutism. At the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the official argument was the will of the sovereign,—an argument which in Germany had reigned so triumphantly that a single town, which had ten times changed masters, changed its religion ten times in a century. Bayle justly reproaches the Catholic clergy of France with having permitted, and even approved, a proceeding so directly contrary to the spirit of their religion, and to the wishes of the Pope. A convert, who wrote a book to prove that Huguenots were in conscience bound to obey the royal edict which prescribed their worship, met with applause a hundred years later. This fault of the French clergy was expiated in the blood of their successors.

The excess of evil led to its gradual cure. In England Protestantism lost its vigour after the victory over the Catholic dynasty; religion faded away, and with it that religious zeal which leads to persecution: when the religious antagonism was no longer kept alive by a political controversy, the sense of right and the spirit of freedom

atque inter illos qui se Ecclesiæ ipsi per susceptum baptismi sacramentum subjecerunt. Primi enim constringi ad catholicam obedientiam non debent; contra vero alteri sunt cogendi." If this theory had, like that of the Protestants, been put in practice by the governments, it would have furnished the Protestants with an argument precisely similar to that by which the Catholics justified the severity they exercised towards them.

which belong to the Anglo-Saxon race accomplished the work which indifference had begun. In Germany the vitality of the Lutheran theology expired after it had lasted for about two hundred years. The intellectual contradictions and the social consequences of the system had become intolerable to the German mind. Rationalism had begun to prevail, when Frederick II. declared that his subjects should work out their salvation in their own way. That generation of men, who looked with contempt on religious zeal, looked with horror on religious persecution. The Catholic Church, which had never taught that princes are supreme over the religion of their subjects, could have no difficulty in going along with public opinion when it disapproved of compulsion in matters of conscience. It was natural that in the new order of things, when Christendom had lost its unity, and Protestantism its violence, she should revert to the position she occupied of old, when she admitted other religions to equal rights with herself, and when men like St. Ambrose, St. Martin, and St. Leo, deprecated the use of violence against heretics. Nevertheless, as the preservation of morality depends on the preservation of faith, both alike are in the interest and within the competence of the State. The Church of her own strength is not strong enough to resist the advance of heresy and unbelief. Those enemies find an auxiliary in the breast of every man whose weakness and whose passions repel him from a Church which imposes such onerous duties on her members. But it is neither possible to define the conditions without which liberty must be fatal to the State, nor the limits beyond which protection and repression become tyrannical, and provoke a reaction more terrible than the indifference of the civil power. The events of the last hundred years have tended in most places to mingle Protestants and Catholics together, and to break down the social and political lines of demarcation between them; and time will show the providential design which has brought about this great change.

These are the subjects treated in the first two chapters* on "The Church and the Nations," and on the Papacy in connexion with the universality of Catholicism, as contrasted with the national and political dependence of heresy. The two following chapters pursue the topic farther in a general historical retrospect, which increases in interest and importance as it proceeds from the social to the religious purpose and influence of the Papacy, and from the past to the present time. The third chapter, "The Churches and Civil Liberty,"

* pp. 1-93.

examines the effects of Protestantism on civil society; the fourth, entitled "The Churches without a Pope," considers the actual theological and religious fruits of separation from the visible Head of the Church.

* The independence of the Church, through that of her Supreme Pontiff, is as nearly connected with political as with religious liberty, since the ecclesiastical system which rejects the Pope logically leads to arbitrary power. Throughout the North of Europe, — in Sweden and Denmark, in Mecklenburg and Pomerania, in Prussia, Saxony, and Brunswick, — the power which the Reformation gave to the State introduced an unmitigated despotism. Every security was removed which protected the people against the abuse of the sovereign power, and the lower against the oppression of the upper class. The crown became, sooner or later, despotic; the peasantry, by a long series of enactments, extending to the end of the seventeenth century, was reduced to servitude; the population grew scanty, and much of the land went out of cultivation. All this is related by the Protestant historians and divines, not in the tone of reluctant admission, but with patriotic indignation, commensurate with the horrors of the truth. In all these countries Lutheran unity subsisted. If Calvinism had ever succeeded in obtaining an equal predominance in the Netherlands, the power of the House of Orange would have become as despotic as that of the Danish or the Prussian sovereigns. But its triumph was impeded by sects, and by the presence of a large Catholic minority, destitute indeed of political rights or religious freedom, but for that very reason removed from the conflicts of parties, and therefore an element of conservatism, and a natural ally of those who resisted the ambition of the Stadtholders. The absence of religious unity baffled their attempts to establish arbitrary power on the victory of Calvinism, and upheld, in conjunction with the brilliant policy abroad, a portion of the ancient freedom. In Scotland, the other home of pure Calvinism, where intolerance and religious tyranny reached a pitch equalled only among the Puritans in America, the perpetual troubles hindered the settlement of a fixed political system, and the restoration of order after the union with England stripped the Presbyterian system of its exclusive supremacy, and opened the way for tolerance and freedom.

Although the political spirit of Anglicanism was as despotic as that of every other Protestant system, circumstances prevented its full development. The Catholic Church had bestowed on the English the great elements of their political

prosperity,—the charter of their liberties, the fusion of the races, and the abolition of villeinage,—that is, personal and general freedom, and national unity. Hence the people were so thoroughly impregnated with Catholicism that the Reformation was imposed on them by foreign troops in spite of an armed resistance; and the imported manufacture of Geneva remained so strange and foreign to them, that no English divine of the sixteenth century enriched it with a single original idea. The new Church, unlike those of the Continent, was the result of an endeavour to conciliate the Catholic disposition of the people, by preserving as far as possible the externals to which they were attached; whilst the queen—who was a Protestant rather by policy than by conviction—desired no greater change than was necessary for her purpose. But the divines whom she placed at the head of the new Church were strict Calvinists, and differed from the Puritans only in their submission to the court. The rapidly-declining Catholic party accepted Anglicanism as the lesser evil; while zealous Protestants deemed that the outward forms ought to correspond to the inward substance, and that Calvinistic doctrines required a Calvinistic constitution. Until the end of the century there was no Anglican theology; and the attempt to devise a system in harmony with the peculiar scheme and design of the institution began with Hooker. The monarch was absolute master in the Church, which had been established as an instrument of royal influence; and the divines acknowledged his right by the theory of passive obedience. The consistent section of the Calvinists was won over for a time by the share which the gentry obtained in the spoils of the Church, and by the welcome concession of the penal laws against her, until at last they found that they had in their intolerance been forging chains for themselves. One thing alone, which our national jurists had recognised in the fifteenth century as the cause and the sign of our superiority over foreign states,—the exclusion of the Roman code, and the unbroken preservation of the common law,—kept England from sinking beneath a despotism as oppressive as that of France or Sweden.

As the Anglican Church under James and Charles was the bulwark of arbitrary power, the popular resistance took the form of ecclesiastical opposition. The Church continued to be so thoroughly committed to the principle of unconditional submission to the power from which it derived its existence, that James II. could reckon on this servile spirit as a means of effecting the subversion of the Establishment; and Defoe reproached the bishops with having led on the king by

their flattery whom they abandoned in the moment of his need. The Revolution, which reduced the royal prerogative, removed the oppressiveness of the royal supremacy. The Established Church was not emancipated from the crown, but the Nonconformists were emancipated from the tyranny of the Established Church. Protestantism, which in the period of its power dragged down by its servility the liberties of the nation, did afterwards, in its decay and disorganisation, by the surrender of its dogmatic as well as of its political principle, promote their recovery and development. It lost its oppressiveness in proportion as it lost its strength, and it ceased to be tyrannical when divines had been forced to give up its fundamental doctrine, and when its unity had been dissolved by the sects. The revival of those liberties which, in the Middle Ages, had taken root under the influence of the Church, coincided with the progress of the Protestant sects, and with the decay of the penal laws. The contrast between the political character of those countries in which Protestantism integrally prevailed, and that of those in which it was divided against itself and could neither establish its system nor work out its consequences, is as strongly marked as the contrast between the politics of Catholic times and those which were introduced by the Reformation. The evil which it wrought in its strength was turned to good by its decline.

Such is the sketch of the effects of the Protestant apostasy in the political order,* considered chiefly in relation to the absence of a supreme ecclesiastical authority independent of political control. It would require far more space to exhibit the positive influence of heretical principles on the social foundations of political life; and the picture would not be complete without showing the contrast exhibited by Catholic States, and tracing their passage from the medieval system under the influence of the reaction against the Reformation. The third chapter covers only a portion of this extensive subject; but it shows the action of the new mode of ecclesiastical government upon the civil order, and proves that the importance of the Papacy is not confined to its religious sphere. It thus prepares the way for the subject discussed in the fourth chapter,† the most comprehensive and elaborate in the book.

Dr. Döllinger begins his survey of the Churches that have renounced the Pope with those of the Eastern schism. The Patriarch of Constantinople, whose ecclesiastical authority is enormous, and whose opportunities of extorting money are

* pp. 93-156.

† pp. 156-490.

so great that he is generally deposed at the end of two or three years, in order that many may succeed each other in the enjoyment of such advantages, serves not as a protection, but as an instrument for the oppression of the Christians. The Greek clergy have been the chief means by which the Turks have kept down both the Greek and the Slavonic population; and the Slaves are by degrees throwing off their influence. Submission to the civil power is so natural in communities separated from the Universal Church, that the Greeks look up to the Turkish authorities as arbiters in ecclesiastical matters. When there was a dispute between Greeks and Armenians respecting the mixture of water with the wine in the chalice, the question was referred for decision to the proper quarter, and the Reis Effendi decided that, wine being condemned by the Koran, water alone might be used. Yet to this pusillanimous and degenerate Church belong the future of European Turkey, and the inheritance of the sinking power of the Turks. The vitality of the dominant race is nearly exhausted, and the Christians—on whose pillage they live—exceed them, in increasing proportions, in numbers, prosperity, intelligence, and enterprise.

The Hellenic Church, obeying the general law of schismatical communities, has exchanged the authority of the patriarch for that of the crown, exercised through a synod, which is appointed on the Russian model by the government. The clergy, disabled for religious purposes by the necessity of providing for their families, have little education and little influence, and have no part in the revival of the Grecian intellect. But the people are attached to their ecclesiastical system, not for religion's sake, for infidelity generally accompanies education, but as the defence of their nationality.

In Russia the Catholic Church is considered heretical because of her teaching on the procession of the Holy Ghost, and schismatical in consequence of the claims of the Pope. In the doctrine of purgatory there is no essential difference; and on this point an understanding could easily be arrived at, if none had an interest in widening the breach. In the seventeenth century, the Russian Church retained so much independence that the Metropolitan of Kiev could hold in check the power of the Czar, and the clergy were the mediators between the people and the nobles or the crown. This influence was swept away by the despotism of Peter the Great; and under Catherine II. the property of the Church was annexed to the crown lands, in order, it was said, to relieve the clergy of the burden of administration. Yet even now the Protestant doctrine that the sovereign is supreme in

all matters of religion has not penetrated among the Russians. But though the Czar does not possess this authority over the national Church, of which he is a member, the Protestant system has conceded it to him in the Baltic provinces. Not only are all children of mixed marriages between Protestants and schismatics brought up in the religion of the latter, by which the gradual decline of Protestantism is provided for, but conversions to Protestantism, even of Jews, Mahometans, and heathens, are forbidden; and, in all questions of doctrine or of liturgy, the last appeal is to the emperor. The religious despotism usually associated with the Russian monarchy subsists only for the Protestants.

The Russian Church is dumb; the congregation does not sing, the priest does not preach. The people have no prayer-books, and are therefore confined to the narrow circle of their own religious ideas. Against the cloud of superstition which naturally gathers in a religion of ceremonies, destitute of the means of keeping alive or cultivating the religious sentiments of the people, there is no resource. In spite of the degeneracy of their clergy, which they are unable to feel, the Russians cling with patriotic affection to their Church, and identify its progress and prosperity with the increase of their empire. As it is an exclusively national institution, every war may become a war of religion, and it is the attachment to the Church which creates the longing and the claim to possess the city from which it came. From the Church the empire derives its tendency to expand, and the Czar the hopes of that universal dominion which was promised to him by the synod of Moscow in 1619, and for which a prayer was then appointed. The schismatical clergy of Eastern Europe are the channel of Russian influence, the pioneers of Russian aggression. The political dependence of the Church corresponds to its political influence; subserviency is the condition of the power it possesses. The certificate of Easter confession and communion is required for every civil act, and is consequently an object of traffic. In like manner, the confessor is bound to betray to the police all the secrets of confession which affect the interest of the government.* In this deplorable state of corruption, servitude, and decay within, and of threatening hostility to Christian civilisation abroad, the Russian Church pays the penalty of its Byzantine descent.

The Established Church and the Sects in England† fur-

* It has even happened that a delinquent has been arrested in the church by the priest to whom he was confessing.

† pp. 190-259.

nish few opportunities of treating points which would be new to our readers. Perhaps the most suggestive portion is the description of the effects of Protestantism on the character and condition of the people. The plunder and oppression of the poor has every where followed the plunder of the Church, which was the guardian and refuge of the poor. The charity of the Catholic clergy aimed not merely at relieving, but at preventing poverty. It was their object not only to give alms, but to give to the lower orders the means of obtaining a livelihood. The Reformation at once checked almsgiving; so that Selden says, in places where twenty pounds a year had been distributed formerly, not a handful of meal was given away in his time, for the wedded clergy could not afford it. The confiscation of the lands, where thousands had tilled the soil under the shadow of the monastery or the church, was followed by a new system of cultivation, which deprived the peasants of their homes. The sheep, men said, were the cause of all the woe; and whole towns were pulled down to make room for them. The prelates of the 16th century lament the decline of charity since the Catholic times; and a divine attributed the growing selfishness and harshness to the doctrine of justification by faith. The alteration in the condition of the poor was followed by severe enactments against vagrancy; and the Protestant legislature, after creating a proletariat, treated it as a crime. The conversion of Sunday into a Jewish Sabbath cut off the holiday amusements and soured the cheerfulness of the population. Music, singing, and dancing, the favourite relaxation of a contented people, disappeared, and, especially after the war in the Low Countries, drunkenness began to prevail among a nation which in earlier times had been reckoned the most sober of Northern Europe. The institution which introduced these changes has become a State, not a national, Church, whose services are more attended by the rich than by the poor.

After describing the various parties in the Anglican system, the decay of its divinity, and the general aversion to theological research, Döllinger concludes that its dissolution is a question of time. No State Church can long subsist in modern society which professes the religion of the minority. Whilst the want of a definite system of doctrine, allowing every clergyman to be the mouth-piece, not of a church, but of a party, drives an increasing portion of the people to join the sects which have a fixed doctrine and allow less independence to their preachers, the great danger which menaces the Church comes from the State itself. The progress of

dissent and of democracy in the legislature will make the Church more and more entirely dependent on the will of the majority, and will drive the best men from the communion of a servile Establishment. The rise and fortunes of Methodism are related with peculiar predilection by the author, who speaks of John Wesley as the greatest intellect English Protestantism has produced, next to Baxter.

The first characteristic of Scottish Presbyterianism is the absence of a theology. The only considerable divines that have appeared in Scotland since the Reformation, Leighton and Forbes, were prelates of the Episcopal Church. Calvinism was unable to produce a theological literature, in spite of the influence of English writers, of the example of Holland, and of the great natural intelligence of the Scots. "Their theology," says a distinguished Lutheran divine, "possesses no system of Christian ethics." This Döllinger attributes to the strictness with which they have held to the doctrine of imputation, which is incompatible with any system of moral theology. In other countries it was the same; where that doctrine prevailed, there was no ethical system, and where ethics were cultivated, the doctrine was abandoned. For a century after Luther, no moral theology was written in Germany. The first who attempted it, Calixtus, gave up the Lutheran doctrine. The Dutch historians of Calvinism in the Netherlands record, in like manner, that there the dread of a collision with the dogma silenced the teaching of ethics both in literature and at the universities. Accordingly, all the great Protestant moralists were opposed to the Protestant doctrine of justification. In Scotland the intellectual lethargy of Churchmen is not confined to the department of ethics; and Presbyterianism only prolongs its existence by suppressing theological writing, and by concealing the contradictions which would otherwise bring down on the clergy the contempt of their flocks.

Whilst Scotland has clung to the original dogma of Calvin, at the price of complete theological stagnation, the Dutch Church has lost its primitive orthodoxy in the progress of theological learning. Not one of the several schools into which the clergy of the Netherlands are divided has remained faithful to the five articles of the synod of Dortrecht, which still command so extensive an allegiance in Great Britain and America. The conservative party, headed by the statesman and historian Groen van Prinsterer, who holds fast to the theology which is so closely interwoven with the history of his country and with the fortunes of the reigning house, and who invokes the aid of the secular arm in support

of pure Calvinism, is not represented at the universities. For all the Dutch divines know that the system cannot be revived without sacrificing the theological activity by which it has been extinguished. The old confessional writings have lost their authority; and the general synod of 1854 decided that, "as it is impossible to reconcile all opinions and wishes, even in the shortest confession, the Church tolerates divergence from the symbolical books." The only unity, says Groen, consists in this, that all the preachers are paid out of the same fund. The bulk of the clergy are Arminians or Socinians. From the spectacle of the Dutch Church Dr. Döllinger comes to the following result: first, that without a code of doctrine laid down in authoritative confessions of faith, the Church cannot endure; secondly, that the old confessional writings cannot be maintained, and are universally given up; and thirdly, that it is impossible to draw up new ones.

French Protestantism suffered less from the Revolution than the Catholic Church, and was treated with tenderness, and sometimes with favour. The dissolution of Continental Protestantism began in France. Before their expulsion in 1685, the French divines had cast off the yoke of the Dortrecht articles, and in their exile they afterwards promoted the decline of Calvinism in the Netherlands. The old Calvinistic tradition has never been restored, the works of the early writers are forgotten, no new theological literature has arisen, and the influence of Germany has borne no considerable fruit. The evangelical party, or Methodists as they are called, are accused by the rest of being the cause of their present melancholy state. The rationalism of the *Indifférens* generally prevails among the clergy, either in the shape of the naturalism of the eighteenth century (Coquerel), or in the more advanced form of modern criticism, as it is carried out by the faculty of Strasburg, with the aid of German infidelity. Payment by the State and hatred of Catholicism are the only common marks of French Protestant divines. They have no doctrine, no discipline, no symbol, no theology. Nobody can define the principle or the limits of their community.

The Calvinism of Switzerland has been ruined in its doctrine by the progress of theology, and in its constitution by the progress of democracy. In Geneva the Church of Calvin fell in the revolutions of 1841 and 1846. The symbolical books are abolished; the doctrine is based on the Bible; but the right of free inquiry is granted to all; the ruling body consists of laymen. "The faith of our fathers," says Merle

d'Aubigné, "counts but a small group of adherents amongst us." In the canton of Vaud, where the whole ecclesiastical power was in the hands of the government, the yoke of the democracy became insupportable, and the excellent writer, Vinet, seceded with 180 ministers out of 250. The people of Berne are among the most bitter enemies of Catholicism in Europe. Their fanaticism crushed the Sonderbund; but the recoil drove them towards infidelity, and hastened the decrease of devotion and of the influence of the clergy. None of the German Swiss, and few of the French, retain in its purity the system of Calvin. The unbelief of the clergy lays the Church open to the attacks of a Cæsaro-papistic democracy. A Swiss Protestant divine said recently: "Only a Church with a Catholic organisation could have maintained itself without a most extraordinary descent of the Holy Spirit against the assaults of Radicalism." "What we want," says another, "in order to have a free Church, is pastors and flocks; dogs and wolves there are in plenty."

In America it is rare to find people who are openly irreligious. Except some of the Germans, all Protestants generally admit the truth of Christianity and the authority of Scripture. But above half of the American population belongs to no particular sect, and performs no religious functions. This is the result of the voluntary principle, of the dominion of the sects, and of the absence of an established Church, to receive each individual from his birth, to adopt him by baptism, and to bring him up in the atmosphere of a religious life. The majority of men will naturally take refuge in indifference and neutrality from the conflict of opinions, and will persuade themselves that where there are so many competitors, none can be the lawful spouse. Yet there is a blessing on every thing that is Christian, which can never be entirely effaced or converted into a curse. Whatever the imperfections of the form in which it exists, the errors mixed up with it, or the degrading influence of human passion, Christianity never ceases to work immeasurable social good. But the great theological characteristic of American Protestantism is the absence of the notion of the Church. The prevailing belief is, that in times past there was always a war of opinions and of parties, that there never was one unbroken vessel, and that it is necessary, therefore, to put up with fragments, one of which is nearly as good as another. Sectarianism, it is vaguely supposed, is the normal condition of religion. Now a sect is, by its very nature, instinctively adverse to a scientific theology; it feels that it is short-lived, without a history, and unconnected with the main stream of

ecclesiastical progress, and it is inspired with hatred and with contempt for the past, for its teaching and its writings. Practically, sectaries hold that a tradition is the more surely to be rejected the older it is, and the more valuable in proportion to the lateness of its origin. As a consequence of the want of roots in the past, and of the thirst for novelty, the history of those sects which are not sunk in lethargy consists in sudden transitions to opposite extremes. In the religious world ill weeds grow apace; and those communities which strike root, spring up, and extend most rapidly, are the least durable and the least respectable. The sects of Europe were transplanted into America; but there the impatience of authority, which is the basis of social and political life, has produced in religion a variety and a multiplicity, of which Europe has no experience.

Whilst these are the fruits of religious liberty and ecclesiastical independence among a people generally educated, the Danish monarchy exhibits unity of faith strictly maintained by keeping the people under the absolute control of the upper class, on whose behalf the Reformation was introduced, and in a state of ignorance corresponding to their oppression. Care was taken that they should not obtain religious instruction, and in the beginning of the eighteenth century the celebrated Bishop Pontoppidan says, "an almost heathen blindness pervades the land." About the same time the Norwegian prelates declared, in a petition to the King of Denmark: "If we except a few children of God, there is only this difference between us and our heathen ancestors, that we bear the name of Christians." The Danish Church has given no signs of life, and has shown no desire for independence since the Reformation; and in return for this submissiveness, the government suppressed every tendency towards dissent. Things were not altered when the tyranny of the nobles gave way to the tyranny of the crown; but when the revolution of 1848 had given the state a democratic basis, its confessional character was abrogated, and whilst Lutheranism was declared the national religion, conformity was no longer exacted. The king is still the head of the Church, and is the only man in Denmark who must be a Lutheran. No form of ecclesiastical government suitable to the new order of things has yet been devised, and the majority prefer to remain in the present provisional state, subject to the will of a parliament, not one member of which need belong to the Church which it governs. Among the clergy, those who are not Rationalists follow the lead of Grundtvig. During many years this able man has conducted an incessant resist-

ance against the progress of unbelief and of the German influence, and against the Lutheran system, the royal supremacy, and the parochial constitution. Not unlike the Tractarians, he desires the liberty of establishing a system which shall exclude Lutheranism, Rationalism, and Erastianism; and he has united in his school nearly all who profess positive Christianity in Denmark. In Copenhagen, out of 150,000 inhabitants, only 6000 go regularly to church. In Altona, there is but one church for 45,000 people. In Schleswig the churches are few and empty. "The great evil," says a Schleswig divine, "is not the oppression which falls on the German tongue, but the irreligion and consequent demoralisation which Denmark has imported into Schleswig. A moral and religious tone is the exception, not the rule, among the Danish clergy."

The theological literature of Sweden consists almost entirely of translations from the German. The clergy, by renouncing study, have escaped Rationalism, and remain faithful to the Lutheran system. The king is supreme in spirituals, and the Diet discusses and determines religious questions. The clergy, as one of the estates, have great political influence, but no ecclesiastical independence. No other Protestant clergy possesses equal privileges or less freedom. It is usual for the minister after the sermon to read out a number of trivial local announcements, sometimes half an hour long; and in a late assembly the majority of the Bishops pronounced in favour of retaining this custom, as none but old women and children would come to church for the service alone. In no other country in Europe is the strict Lutheran system preached but in Sweden. The doctrine is preserved, but religion is dead, and the Church is as silent and as peaceful as the churchyard. The Church is richly endowed; there are great universities, and Swedes are among the foremost in almost every branch of science; but no Swedish writer has ever done any thing for religious thought. The example of Denmark and its Rationalist clergy brought home to them the consequences of theological study. In one place the old system has been preserved, like a frail and delicate curiosity, by excluding the air of scientific inquiry, whilst in the other Lutheranism is decomposing under its influence. In Norway, where the clergy have no political representation, religious liberty was established in 1844.

Throughout the north of Europe the helpless decline of Protestantism is betrayed by the numerical disproportion of preachers to the people. Norway, with a population of

1,500,000, thinly scattered over a very large territory, has 485 parishes, with an average of 3600 souls a piece. But the clergy are pluralists, and as many as five parishes are often united under a single incumbent. Holstein has only 192 preachers for an almost exclusively Lutheran population of 544,000. In Schleswig many parishes have been deserted because they were too poor to maintain a clergyman's family. Sometimes there are only two ministers for 13,000 persons. In the Baltic provinces the proportion is one to 4394. In this way the people have to bear the burden of a clergy with families to support.

The most brilliant and important part of this chapter is devoted to the state of Protestantism in the author's native country.* He speaks with the greatest authority and effect when he comes near home, describes the opinions of men who have been his rivals in literature, or his adversaries in controversy, and touches on discussions which his own writings have influenced. There is a difference also in the tone. When he speaks of the state of other countries, with which he has made himself acquainted as a traveller, or through the writings of others, he preserves the calmness and objectivity of a historian, and adds few reflections to the simple description of facts. But in approaching the scenes and the thoughts of his own country, the interests and the most immediate occupations of his own life, the familiarity of long experience gives greater confidence, warmth, and vigour to his touch; the historian gives way to the divine, and the narrative sometimes slides into theology. Besides the position of the author, the difference of the subject justifies a change in the treatment. The examination of Protestantism in the rest of the world pointed with monotonous uniformity to a single conclusion. Every where there was the same spectacle and the same alternative: either religion sacrificed to the advancement of learning, or learning relinquished for the preservation of religion. Every where the same antagonism between intellectual progress and fidelity to the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism. Either religion has become stark and stagnant in states which protect unity by the proscription of knowledge, or the progress of thought and inquiry has undermined belief in the Protestant system, and driven its professors from one untenable position to another, or the ascendancy of the sectarian spirit has been equally fatal to its dogmatic integrity and to its intellectual development. But in the home of the Reformation a league has been concluded in our time between theo-

* Pp. 386-490.

logy and religion, and many schools of Protestant divines are labouring, with a vast expenditure of ability and learning, to devise, or to restore, with the aid of theological science, a system of positive Christianity. Into this great scene of intellectual exertion and doctrinal confusion the leading adversary of Protestantism in Germany conducts his readers, not without sympathy for the high aims which inspire the movement, but with the almost triumphant security which belongs to a Church possessing an acknowledged authority, a definite organisation, and a system brought down by tradition from the apostolic age. Passing by the schools of infidelity, which have no bearing on the topic of his work, he addresses himself to the believing Protestantism of Germany, and considers its efforts to obtain a position which may enable it to resist unbelief without involving submission to the Church.

The character of Luther separates the German Protestants from those of other countries. His was the master-spirit, in whom his contemporaries beheld the incarnation of the genius of their nation. In the strong lineaments of his character they recognised, in heroic proportions, the reflection of their own ; and thus his name has survived, not merely as that of a great man, the mightiest of his age, but as the type of a whole period in the history of the German people, the centre of a new world of ideas, the personification of those religious and ethical opinions which the country followed, and whose influence even their adversaries could not escape. His writings have long ceased to be popular, and are read only as monuments of history ; but the memory of his person has not yet grown dim. His name is still a power in his own country, and from its magic the Protestant doctrine derives a portion of its life. In other countries men dislike to be described by the name of the founder of their religious system ; but in Germany and Sweden there are thousands who are proud of the name of Lutheran.

The results of his system prevail in the more influential and intelligent classes, and penetrate the mass of the modern literature of Germany. The Reformation had introduced the notion that Christianity was a failure, and had brought far more suffering than blessings on mankind ; and the consequences of that movement were not calculated to impress educated men with the belief that things were changed for the better, or that the Reformers had achieved the work in which the Apostles were unsuccessful. Thus an atmosphere of unbelief and of contempt for every thing Christian gradually arose, and Paganism appeared more

cheerful, more human, and more poetical, than the repulsive Galilean doctrine of holiness and privation. This spirit still governs the educated class. Christianity is abominated both in life and in literature, even under the form of believing Protestantism.

In Germany theological study and the Lutheran system subsisted for two centuries together. The controversies that arose from time to time developed the theory, but brought out by degrees its inward contradictions. The danger of biblical studies was well understood, and the Scriptures were almost universally excluded from the Universities in the seventeenth century; but in the middle of the eighteenth Bengel revived the study of the Bible, and the dissolution of the Lutheran doctrine began. The rise of historical learning hastened the process. Frederic the Great says of himself, that the notion that the history of the Church is a drama, conducted by rogues and hypocrites, at the expense of the deceived masses, was the real cause of his contempt for the Christian religion. The Lutheran theology taught, that after the Apostolic age God withdrew from the Church, and abandoned to the devil the office which, according to the Gospel, was reserved for the Holy Spirit. This diabolical millennium lasted till the appearance of Luther. As soon, therefore, as the reverence for the symbolical books began to wane, the belief in the divine foundation departed with the belief in the divine guidance of the Church, and the root was judged by the stem, the beginning by the continuation. As research went on, unfettered now by the authorities of the sixteenth century, the clergy became Rationalists, and stone after stone of the temple was carried away by its own priests. The infidelity which at the same time flourished in France, did not, on the whole, infect the priesthood. But in Germany it was the divines who destroyed religion, the pastors who impelled their flocks to renounce the Christian faith.

In 1817 the Prussian Union added a new Church to the two original forms of Protestantism. But strict Calvinism is nearly extinct in Germany, and the old Lutheran Church itself has almost disappeared. It subsists, not in any definite reality, but only in the aspirations of certain divines and jurists. The purpose of the union was to bring together, in religious communion, the reigning family of Prussia, which had adopted Calvinism in 1613, and the vast Lutheran majority among the people. It was to be, in the words of the king, a merely ritual union, not an amalgamation of dogmas. In some places there was resistance, which was put down by

military execution. Some thousands emigrated to America; but the public press applauded the measures, and there was no general indignation at their severity. The Lutherans justly perceived that the union would promote religious indifference: but at the accession of the late king there came a change. Religious faith was once more sought after; believing professors were appointed in almost all the German Universities, after the example of Prussia; Jena and Giessen alone continued to be seats of Rationalism. As soon as theology had begun to recover a more religious and Christian character, two very divergent tendencies manifested themselves. Among the disciples of Schleiermacher and of Neander a school of unionists arose who attempted a conciliatory intermediate theology. At the same time a strictly Lutheran theology flourished at the Universities of Erlangen, Leipzig, Rostock, and Dorpat, which sought to revive the doctrine of the sixteenth century, clothed in the language of the nineteenth. But for men versed in Scripture theology this was an impossible enterprise, and it was abandoned by the divines to a number of parochial clergymen, who are represented in literature by Rudelbach, and who claim to be the only surviving Protestants whom Luther would acknowledge as his sons and the heirs of his spirit.

The Lutheran divines and scholars formed the new Lutheran party,* whose most illustrious lay champion was the celebrated Stahl. They profess the Lutheran doctrine of justification, but reject the notion of the invisible Church and the universal priesthood. Holding to the divine institution of the offices of the Church, in opposition to the view which refers them to the congregation, they are led to assume a sacrament of orders, and to express opinions on ordination, sacraments, and sacrifice, which involve them in the imputation of Puseyism, or even of Catholicism. As they remain for the most part in the State Church, there is an open war between their confessional spirit and the syncretism of the union. In 1857 the Evangelical Alliance met at Berlin in order to strengthen the unionist principles, and to testify against these Pharisees. Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians,—sects connected by nothing but a common hatred of Catholicism,—were greeted by the union divines as bone of their bone, and welcome allies in the contest with an exclusive Lutheranism and with Rome. The confusion in the minds of the people was increased by this spectacle. The union already implied that the dogma of the Lord's

* The works contained in Clarke's Library of Translations are chiefly of this school.

Supper, on which Lutherans and Calvinists disagree, was uncertain, and therefore not essential. The alliance of so many denominations added baptism to the list of things about which nothing is positively known. The author of this measure was Bunsen, who was full of the idea of uniting all Protestant sects in a union against the Catholic Church and catholicising tendencies.

For the last fifteen years there has been an active agitation for the improvement of the Church among the Protestant divines. The first question that occupies and divides them is that of Church government and the royal episcopate, which many deem the chief cause of the ecclesiastical decay. The late King of Prussia, a zealous and enlightened friend of the Protestant Church, declared that "the territorial system, and the episcopal authority of the sovereign, are of such a nature that either of them would alone be enough to kill the Church if the Church was mortal," and that he longed to be able to abdicate his rights into the hands of the Bishops. In other countries, as in Baden, a new system has been devised, which transfers political constitutionalism to the Church, and makes it a community, not of those who believe in Christ, but, in the words of the government organ, of those who believe in a moral order. Hopes were entertained that the introduction of synods would be an improvement, and in 1856 and 1857 a beginning was made at Berlin; but it was found that the existence of great evils and disorders in the Church, which had been a secret of the initiated, would be published to the world, and that government by majorities, the ecclesiastical democracy which was Bunsen's ideal, would soon destroy every vestige of Christianity.

In their doctrinal and theological literature resides at the present day the strength and the renown of the Protestants; for a scientific Protestant theology exists only in Germany. The German Protestant Church is emphatically a Church of theologians; they are its only authority, and, through the princes, its supreme rulers. Its founder never really divested himself of the character of a professor, and the Church has never emancipated itself from the lecture-room: it teaches, and then disappears. Its hymns are not real hymns, but versified theological dissertations, or sermons in rhyme. Born of the union of princes with professors, it retains the distinct likeness of both its parents, not altogether harmoniously blended; and when it is accused of worldliness, of paleness of thought, of being a police institution rather than a Church, that is no more than to say that the child cannot deny its parentage.

Theology has become believing in Germany, but it is very far from being orthodox. No writer is true to the literal teaching of the symbolical books, and for a hundred years the pure doctrine of the sixteenth century has never been heard. No German divine could submit to the authority of the early articles and formulas without hypocrisy and violence to his conscience, and yet they have nothing else to appeal to. That the doctrine of justification by faith only is the principal substance of the symbolical writings, the centre of the antagonism against the Catholic Church, all are agreed. The neo-Lutherans proclaim it "the essence and treasure of the Reformation," "the doctrine of which every man must have a clear and vivid comprehension, who would know any thing of Christianity," "the banner which must be unfurled at least once in every sermon," "the permanent death that gnaws the bones of Catholics," "the standard by which the whole of the gospel must be interpreted, and every obscure passage explained;" and yet this article of a standing or falling Church, on the strength of which Protestants call themselves evangelical, is accepted by scarcely one of their more eminent divines, even among the Lutherans. The progress of biblical studies is too great to admit of a return to the doctrine which has been exploded by the advancement of religious learning. Dr. Döllinger gives a list (p. 430) of the names of the leading theologians, by all of whom it has been abandoned. Yet it was for the sake of this fundamental and essential doctrine that the epistle of St. James was pronounced an epistle of straw, that the Augsburg Confession declared it to have been the belief of St. Augustine, and that when the author of the Confession had for very shame omitted this falsehood in the published edition, the passage was restored after his death. For its sake Luther deliberately altered the sense of several passages in the Bible, especially in the writings of St. Paul. To save this doctrine, which was unknown to all Christian antiquity, the breach was made with all ecclesiastical tradition, and the authority of the dogmatic testimony of the Church in every age was rejected. While the contradiction between the Lutheran doctrine and that of the first centuries was disguised before the laity, it was no secret among the Reformers. Melancthon confessed to Breuz, that in the Augsburg Confession he had lied. Luther admitted that his theory was new, and sought in consequence to destroy the authority of the early Fathers and Councils. Calvin declared that the system was unknown to tradition. All these men and their disciples, and the whole of the Lutheran and Calvinistic

theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, professed to find their doctrine of imputation laid down distinctly in the Bible. The whole modern scientific theology of the Protestants rejects both the doctrine and the Lutheran exegesis of the passages in question. But it is the supreme evangelical principle, that the Scripture is perfectly clear and sufficient on all fundamental points. Yet the point on which this great divergence subsists is a doctrine which is decisive for the existence of the Church, and most important in its practical influence on life. The whole edifice of the Protestant Church and theology reposes therefore on two principles; one material, the other formal; the doctrine of imputation, and the sufficiency of the Bible. But the material principle is given up by exegesis and by dogmatic theology; and as to the formal principle, for the sufficiency of the Bible, or even for the inspiration of the writings of the disciples of the Apostles, not the shadow of a scriptural argument can be adduced. The significance of this great fact is beginning to make its way. "Whilst Rationalism prevailed," says a famous Lutheran divine, "we could impute to its action that our churches were deserted and empty. But now that Christ crucified is every where preached, and no serious effect is to be observed, it is necessary to abandon this mistake, and not to conceal from ourselves that preaching is unable to revive religious life."

The religious indifference of the educated classes is the chief security for the existence of the Protestant Church. If they were to take an interest in matters of worship and doctrine, and to inform themselves as to the present relation of theological science to the teaching of the pulpit, the day of discovery and exposure would come, and confidence in the Church would be at an end. The dishonesty of Luther in those very things on which the Reformation depended could not be concealed from them. In Prussia there was a conscientious clergyman who taught his parishioners Greek, and then showed them all the passages, especially in the Epistles of St. Paul, which were intentionally altered in the translation. But one of the Protestant leaders impresses on the clergy the danger of allowing the people to know that which ought to be kept a secret among the learned. At most, he says, it may be necessary to admit that the translation is not perspicuous. The danger of this discovery does not, however, appear to be immediate, for no book is less familiar to the laity than the Bible. "There is scarcely one Christian family in a hundred," says Tholuck, "in which the Holy Scriptures are read."

In the midst of this general downfall of Christianity in spite of the great efforts of Protestants, some take refuge in the phrase of an invisible Church, some in a Church of the future. Whilst there exists a real living universal Church with a settled system and means of salvation, an invisible Church is offered in her stead, wrapped up in the swaddling clothes of rhetoric, like the stone which Rhea gave her husband instead of the child. In a novel of Jean Paul, a Swedish clergyman is advised in the middle of winter to walk about with a bit of orange-sugar in his mouth, in order to realise with all his senses the sunny climes of the south. It requires as much imagination to realise the Church by taking a "spiritual league" into one's mouth.

Another acknowledgment, that the Church has become estranged from the people, and subsists only as a ruin of a past age, is the widely spread hope of a new Pentecost. Eminent theologians speak of it as the only conceivable salvation; though there is no such promise in Scripture, no example in history of a similar desire. They rest their only hope in a miracle, such as has not happened since the Apostles, and thereby confess that, in the normal process of religious life by which Christ has guided His Church till now, their cause is lost. A symptom of the same despair is the rise of chiliastic aspirations, and the belief in the approaching end of the world. To this party belongs the present minister of public worship and education in Berlin. Shortly before his appointment he wrote: "Both Church and State must perish in their earthly forms, that the kingdom of Christ may be set up over all nations, that the bride of the Lamb, the perfect community, the new Jerusalem, may descend from heaven." Not long before this was published, another Prussian statesman, Bunsen, had warned his Protestant readers to turn away from false prophets, who announce the end of the world because they have come to the end of their own wisdom.

In the midst of this desperate weakness, although Catholics and Protestants are so mixed up with each other that toleration must soon be universal throughout Germany, the thoughts of the Protestants are yet not turned towards the Catholic Church; they still show a bitter animosity against her, and the reproach of Catholic tendencies has for twenty years been the strongest argument against every attempt to revive religion and worship. The attitude of Protestantism towards Rome, says Stahl, is that of the Borghese gladiator. To soften this spirit of animosity, the only possible resource is to make it clear to all Protestants who still

hold to Christianity, what their own internal condition is, and what they have come to by their rejection of the unity and the authority which the Catholic Church possesses in the Holy See. Having shown the value of the Papacy by the results which have ensued on its rejection, Döllinger proceeds, with the same truth and impartiality, to trace the events which have injured the influence and diminished the glory and attractiveness of the Holy See, and have converted that which should be the safeguard of its spiritual freedom into a calamity and a dishonour in the eyes of mankind. It seems as though he wished to point out, as the moral to be learnt from the present condition of the religious world, that there is a coincidence in time and in providential purpose between the exhaustion and the despair at which enlightened Protestantism has arrived, from the failure of every attempt to organise a form of church-government, to save the people from infidelity, and to reconcile theological knowledge with their religious faith,—between this and that great drama which, by destroying the bonds which linked the Church to an untenable system, is preparing the restoration of the Holy See to its former independence, and to its just influence over the minds of men.

The Popes, after obtaining a virtual independence under the Byzantine sceptre, transferred their allegiance to the revived empire of the West. The line between their authority and that of the emperor in Rome was never clearly drawn. It was a security for the freedom and regularity of the election, which was made by the lay as well as ecclesiastical dignitaries of the city, that it should be subject to the imperial ratification ; but the remoteness of the emperors, and the inconvenience of delay, caused this rule to be often broken. This prosperous period did not long continue. When the dynasty of Charlemagne came to an end, the Roman clergy had no defence against the nobles, and the Romans did all that men could do to ruin the Papacy. There was little remaining of the state which the Popes had formed in conjunction with the emperors. In the middle of the tenth century exarchate and Pentapolis were in the power of Berengarius, and Rome in the hands of the senator Alberic. Alberic, understanding that a secular principality could not last long, obtained the election of his son Octavian, who became Pope John XII. Otho the Great, who had restored the empire, and claimed to exercise its old prerogative, deposed the new Pope ; and when the Romans elected another, sent him also into exile beyond the Alps. For a whole century after this time there was no trace of freedom of election.

Without the emperor, the Popes were in the hands of the Roman factions, and dependence on the emperor was better for the Church than dependence on the nobles. The Popes appointed under the influence of the prelates, who were the ecclesiastical advisers of the imperial government, were preferable to the nominees of the Roman chiefs, who had no object or consideration but their own ambition, and were inclined to speculate on the worthlessness of their candidates. During the first half of the eleventh century they recovered their predominance, and the deliverance of the Church came once more from Germany. A succession of German Popes, named by the emperor, opened the way for the permanent reform which is associated with the name of Gregory VII. Up to this period the security of the freedom of the Holy See was the protection of the emperor, and Gregory was the last Pope who asked for the imperial confirmation.

Between the middle of the ninth century and the middle of the eleventh the greater part of the Roman territory had passed into the hands of laymen. Some portions were possessed by the emperor, some by the great Italian families, and the revenues of the Pope were derived from the tribute of his vassals. Sylvester II. complains that this was very small, as the possessions of the Church had been given away for very little. Besides the tribute, the vassals owed feudal service to the Pope; but the government was not in his hands, and the imperial suzerainty remained. The great families had obtained from the Popes of their making such extensive grants that there was little remaining, and Otho III. tried to make up for it by a new donation. The loss of the patrimonies in Southern Italy established a claim on the Norman conquerors, and they became papal vassals for the kingdom of Sicily. But throughout the twelfth century the Popes had no firm basis of their power in Italy. They were not always masters of Rome, and there was not a single provincial town they could reckon on. Seven Popes in a hundred years sought a refuge in France; two remained at Verona. The donation of Matilda was disputed by the emperors, and brought no material accession of territory, until Innocent III., with his usual energy, secured to the Roman Church the south of Tuscany. He was the first Pope who governed a considerable territory, and became the real founder of the States of the Church. Before him the Popes had possessions for which they claimed tribute and service, but no state that they administered. Innocent obtained the submission of Benevento and Romagna. He left the towns to govern themselves by their own laws, demanding only

military aid in case of need, and a small tribute, which was not always exacted. Viterbo, for instance, paid nothing until the fifteenth century.

The contest with Frederic II. stripped the Holy See of most of these acquisitions. In many cases its civil authority was no longer acknowledged; in many it became a mere title of honour, while the real power had passed into the hands of the towns or of the nobles; sometimes into those of the Bishops. Rodolph of Habsburg restored all that had been lost, and surrendered the imperial claims. But while the German influence was suspended, the influence of France prevailed over the Papacy; and during the exile at Avignon the Popes were as helpless as if they had possessed not an acre of their own in Italy. It was during their absence that the Italian Republics fell under the Tyrannis, and their dominions were divided among a swarm of petty princes. The famous expedition of Cardinal Albornozy put an end to these disorders. He recovered the territories of the Church, and became, by the *Ægidian Constitutions*, which survived for ages, the legislator of Romagna. In 1376 eighty towns rose up in the space of three days, declared themselves free, or recalled the princes whom Albornozy had expelled. Before they could be reduced, the schism broke out, and the Church learnt the consequences of the decline of the empire and the disappearance of its advocacy and protectorate over the Holy See. Boniface IX. sold to the republics and the princes, for a sum of money and an annual tribute, the ratification of the rights which they had seized.

The first great epoch in the history of the temporal power after the schism is the election of Eugene IV. He swore to observe a statute which had been drawn up in Conclave, by which all vassals and officers of state were to swear allegiance to the College of Cardinals in conjunction with the Pope. As he also undertook to abandon to the Cardinals half the revenue, he shared in fact his authority with them. This was a new form of government, and a great restriction of the papal power; but it did not long endure.

The centrifugal tendency, which broke up Italy into small principalities, had long prevailed, when at last the Popes gave way to it. The first was Sixtus IV., who made one of his nephews lord of Imola, and another of Sinigaglia. Alexander VI. subdued all the princes in the States of the Church except the Duke of Montefeltro, and intended to make the whole an hereditary monarchy for his son. But Julius II. recovered all these conquests for the Church, added new ones to them, and thus became, after Innocent III.

and Albornoz, the third founder of the Roman State. The age which beheld this restoration was marked in almost every country by the establishment of political unity on the ruins of the medieval independence, and of monarchical absolutism at the expense of medieval freedom. Both of these tendencies asserted themselves in the States of the Church. The liberties of the towns were gradually destroyed. This was accomplished by Clement VII. in Ancona, in 1532; by Paul III. in Perugia, in 1540. Ravenna, Faenza, Jesi, had, under various pretexts, undergone the same fate. By the middle of the sixteenth century, all resistance was subdued. In opposition, however, to this centralising policy, the nepotism introduced by Sixtus IV. led to dismemberment. Paul III. gave Parma and Piacenza to his son Pier Luigi Farnese, and the duchy was lost to the Holy See for good. Paul IV. made a similar attempt in favour of his nephew Caraffa, but he was put to death under Pius IV.; and this species of nepotism, which subsisted at the expense of the papal territory, came to an end. Pius V. forbade, under pain of excommunication, to invest any one with a possession of the Holy See, and this law was extended even to temporary concessions.

In the eighteenth century a time came when the temporal power was a source of weakness, and a weapon by which the courts compelled the Pope to consent to measures he would otherwise never have approved. It was thus that the suppression of the Jesuits was obtained from Clement XIV. Under his successors the world had an opportunity of comparing the times when Popes like Alexander III. or Innocent IV. governed the Church from their exile, and now, when men of the greatest piety and conscientiousness virtually postponed their duty as head of the Church to their rights as temporal sovereigns, and, like the senators of old, awaited the Gauls upon their throne. There is a lesson not to be forgotten in the contrast between the policy and the fate of the great medieval Pontiffs, who preserved their liberty by abandoning their dominions, and that of Pius VI. and Pius VII., who preferred captivity to flight.

The nepotism of Urban VIII. brought on the war of Castro, and in its train increase of debt, of taxes, impoverishment of the State, and the odious union of spiritual with temporal arms, which became a permanent calamity for the Holy See. This attachment to the interest of their families threw great discredit on the Popes, who were dishonoured by the faults, the crimes, and the punishment of their relatives. But since the death of Alexander VIII., in 1691,

even that later form of nepotism which aimed at wealth only, not at political power, came to an end, and has never reappeared except in the case of the Braschi. The nepotism of the cardinals and prelates has survived that of the Popes. If the statute of Eugene IV. had remained in force, the College of Cardinals would have formed a wholesome restraint in the temporal government, and the favouritism of the papal relations would have been prevented. But the Popes acted with the absolute power which was in the spirit of the monarchies of that age. When Paul IV. announced to the Sacred College that he had stripped the house of Colonna of its possessions to enrich his nephew, and that he was at war with Spain, they listened in silence, and have been passive ever since. No European sovereignty enjoyed so arbitrary an authority. Under Julius II. the towns retained considerable privileges, and looked on their annexation to the Papal State as a deliverance from their former oppressors. Machiavelli and Guicciardini say that the Popes required neither to defend nor to administer their dominions, and that the people were content in the enjoyment of their autonomy. In the course of the sixteenth century the administration was gradually centralised in Rome, and placed in the hands of ecclesiastics. Before 1550 the governors were ordinarily laymen, but the towns themselves preferred to be governed by prelates. By the close of the century the independence of the corporations had disappeared; but the centralisation, though complete, was not vigorous, and practically the towns and the barons, though not free, were not oppressed.

The modern system of government in the Roman States originated with Sixtus V. He introduced stability and regularity in the administration, and checked the growth of nepotism, favouritism, and arbitrary power, by the creation of permanent congregations. In connexion with this measure the prelates became the upper class of official persons in the State, and were always expected to be men of fortune. A great burden for the country was the increase of offices, which were created only to be sold. No important duties and no fixed salary were attached to them, and the incumbent had to rely on fees and extortion. In the year 1470 there were 650 places of this kind. In eighty years they had increased to 3500. The theory was, that the money raised by the sale of places saved the people from the imposition of new taxes. Innocent XII., in 1693, put an end to this traffic; but it had continued so long that the ill effects survived.

There was a great contrast between the ecclesiastical administration, which exhibited a dignified stability, resting on fixed rules and ancient traditions, and the civil government, which was exposed to continual fluctuation by the change of persons, of measures, and of systems; for few Popes continued the plans of their predecessors. The new Pontiff commenced his reign generally with a profound sense of the abuses and of the discontent which prevailed before his elevation, and naturally sought to obtain favour and improvement by opposite measures. In the cultivation of the Roman Campagna, for instance, it was observed that each Pope followed a different system, so that little was accomplished. The persons were almost always changed by the new Pope, so that great offices rarely remained long in the same hands. The Popes themselves were seldom versed in affairs of state, and therefore required the assistance of statesmen of long experience. In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, when the election was free from outward influence, men were generally chosen who had held under one or two Popes the highest office of state,—Gregory VII., Urban II., Gelasius II., Lucius II., Alexander III., Gregory VIII., Gregory IX., Alexander IV. But in modern times it has been the rule that the secretary of state should not be elected, and that the new Pope should dismiss the heads of the administration. Clement IX. was the first who gave up this practice, and retained almost all those who had been employed under his predecessor.

The burdens of the state increased far beyond its resources from the aid which the Popes gave to the Catholic powers, especially in the Turkish wars. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the debt amounted to 12,242,620 scudi, and the interest absorbed three-fourths of the whole income. In 1655 it had risen to 48,000,000 scudi. The financial administration was secret, free from the control of public accounts, and the *Tesoriere*, being necessarily a cardinal, was irresponsible. There was no industry in the towns; they remained for the most part small and poor; almost all articles of common use were imported, and the country had little to give in exchange. All the interest of the public debt went to foreign creditors. As early as 1595 the discontent was very great; and so many emigrated, in order to escape the heavy burdens, that Cardinal Sacchetti said, in 1664, that the population was reduced by one-half. In the year 1740 the president De Brosses found the Roman government the most defective but the mildest in Europe. Becattini, in his panegyrical biography of Pius VI., declares that it was the worst

after that of Turkey. There were none of those limitations which in other countries restrained the power of the monarch,—no fundamental laws, no coronation oath, no binding decrees of predecessors, no provincial estates, no powerful corporations. But, in reality, this unlimited absolutism was softened by custom, and by great indulgence towards individuals.

When Consalvi adopted the French institutions, he did not understand that an absolute government is intolerable, and must sink under the weight of its responsibility, unless it recognises the restraint of custom and tradition, and of subordinate but not dependent forces. The unity and uniformity he introduced were destructive. He restored none of the liberties of the towns, and confided the administration to ecclesiastics superficially acquainted with law, and without knowledge of politics or of public economy. In the ecclesiastical States of Germany, the civil and religious departments were separate; and it is as wrong to say that the double position of the head must repeat itself throughout the administration, as to say that a king, because he is the head of the army as well as of the civil government, ought to mix the two spheres throughout the state. It would, in reality, be perfectly possible to separate the political and ecclesiastical authorities.

Leo XII. attempted to satisfy the Zelanti, the adversaries of Consalvi, by restoring the old system. He abolished the provincial councils, revived the Inquisition, and subjected official honesty and public morality to a strict espionage. Leo saw the error of Consalvi, but mistook the remedy; and his government was the most unpopular that had been seen for a century. Where the laity are excluded from the higher offices, and the clergy enjoy the monopoly of them, that moral power which modern bureaucracy derives from the corporate spirit, and the feelings of honour which it inspires, cannot subsist. One class becomes demoralised by its privileged position, the other by its limited prospects and insufficient pay. Leo tried to control them by the *congregazione di vigilanze*, which received and examined all charges against official persons; but it was suppressed by his successor.

The famous Memorandum of the Powers, 31st May 1831, recommended the admission of the laity to all secular offices, the restoration of the provincial councils, and the introduction of elective communal councils with the power of local government, and, finally, a security against the changes incident to an elective sovereignty. The historian Coppi, who

was charged to draw up a plan of reform in reply to these demands, relates that the Pope and the majority of the Cardinals rejected every serious change, and were resolved to uphold the old principles, and to concede nothing to the lay party, "because, if any thing was voluntarily conceded, there would be no right of recalling it afterwards." Two things in particular it was determined not to grant,—elective councils in the towns and provinces, and a lay council of state beside the Sacred College. In a general way, vague reforms were promised; but the promise was not redeemed. Austria would not tolerate any liberal concessions in Italy, which were in contradiction with her own system and her own interests; thus all Italian aspirations for reform were concentrated in the wish to get rid of the foreign yoke, and Austria never succeeded in forming a party amongst the Italians favourable to her power. Yet Gregory XVI. knew that great changes were needed. In 1843 he said: "The civil administration requires a great reform. I was too old when I was elected; I did not expect to live so long, and had not the courage to begin the undertaking. For whoever begins, must accomplish it. I have now only a few years to live; perhaps only a few days. After me they will choose a young Pope, whose mission it will be to perform the act, without which it is impossible to go on."

The Austrian occupation caused the Roman government to be identified with the foreign supremacy, and transferred to it the hatred of the patriots. The disaffection of the subjects of the Pope had deeper motives. Except the clergy, that overshadows all, there are no distinct orders in the society of the Roman State; no country nobility, no wealthy class of peasant proprietors; nothing but the population of the towns, and a degenerate class of patricians. These were generally hostile to the ecclesiastical system. The offices are so distributed, that the clergy govern, and the laity are their instruments. In the principal departments, no amount of services or ability could raise a layman above a certain level, beyond which younger and less competent ecclesiastics were promoted over his head. This subordination, which led to a regular dependence of the lay officials on the prelates, drove the best men away from the service of the state, and disposed the rest to long for a government which should throw open to them the higher prizes of their career. Even the country people, who were never tainted with the ideas of the secret societies, were not always well affected.

It is more difficult for a priest than for a layman to put aside his private views and feelings in the administration of

justice. He is the servant and herald of grace, of forgiveness, of indulgence, and easily forgets that in human concerns the law is inexorable, that favour to one is often injury to many or to all, and that he has no right to place his own will above the law. He is still more disqualified for the direction of the police, which, in an absolute state and in troubled times, uses its unlimited power without reference to Christian ideas, leaves unpunished acts which are grievous sins, and punishes others which in a religious point of view are innocent. It is hard for the people to distinguish clearly the priestly character from the action of its bearer in the administration of police. The same indifference to the strict letter of the law, the same confusion between breaches of divine and of human ordinances, led to a practice of arbitrary imprisonment, which contrasts painfully with the natural gentleness of a priestly government. Hundreds of persons were cast into prison without a trial or even an examination, only on suspicion, and kept there more than a year for greater security.

The immunities of the clergy were as unpopular as their power. The laws and decrees of the Pope as a temporal sovereign were not held to be binding on them unless it was expressly said, or was clear from the context, that they were given also in his character of Head of the Church. Ecclesiastics were tried before their own tribunals, and had the right to be more lightly punished than laymen for the same delinquency. Those events in the life of Achilli, which came out at his trial, had not only brought down on him no severe punishment, but did not stand in the way of his promotion. With all these privileges, the bulk of the Roman clergy had little to do; little was expected of them, and their instruction was extremely deficient.

At the end of the pontificate of Gregory XVI. the demand for reforms was loud and universal, and men began to perceive that the defects of the civil government were undermining the religious attachment of the people. The Conclave which raised Pius IX. to the papal throne was the shortest that had occurred for near 300 years. The necessity of choosing a Pontiff disposed to understand and to satisfy the pressing requirements of the time, made it important to hasten matters, in order to escape the interference of Austria. It was expected that Cardinal Gizzi or Cardinal Mastai would be elected. The latter had been pointed out by Gregory XVI. as his fittest successor, and he made Gizzi secretary of state. The first measure of the new reign, the amnesty, which, as Metternich said, threw open the doors of the house to the

professional robbers, was taken not so much as an act of policy, as because the Pope was resolved to undo an accumulation of injustice. The reforms which followed soon made Pius the most popular of Italian princes; and all Catholics rejoiced that the reconciliation of the Papacy with modern freedom was at length accomplished, and that the shadow which had fallen on the priesthood throughout the world was removed with the abuses in the Roman government. The Constitution was, perhaps, an inevitable though a fatal necessity. "The Holy Father must fall," said his minister; "but at least he will fall with honour." The preliminary conditions of constitutional life were wanting—habits of self-government in the towns and provinces, security from the vexations of the police, separation of spiritual and temporal jurisdiction. It could not be but that the existence of an elective chamber must give to the lay element a preponderance in the state, whilst in the administration the contrary position was maintained. There could be no peaceful solution of this contradiction; and it is strange that the Cardinals, who were unanimously in favour of the statute, should not have seen that it would lead to the destruction of the privileges of the clergy. But in the allocution of 20th April 1849, the Pope declared that he had never intended to alter the character of his government; so that he must have thought the old system of administration by ecclesiastics compatible with the working of the new Constitution. At his return from exile, all his advisers were in favour of abrogating all the concessions of the first years of his reign. Balbo and Rosmini visited him at Gaeta, to plead for the Constitution; but they obtained nothing. Pius IX. was persuaded that every concession would be a weapon in the hands of the Radicals. A lay *consulta* gave to the laity a share in the supreme government; but the chief offices and the last decision remained, as before, in the hands of the prelates. Municipal reforms were promised. In general the old defects continued, and the old discontent was not conciliated.

It is manifest that Constitutionalism, as it is ordinarily understood, is not a system which can be applied to the States of the Church. It could not be tolerated that a war-like faction, by refusing supplies, should compel the Pope to go to war with a Christian nation, as they sought to compel him to declare war against Austria in 1848. His sovereignty must be real, not merely nominal. It makes no difference whether he is in the power of a foreign state or of a parliamentary majority. But real sovereignty is compatible with a participation of the people in legislation, the autonomy of

corporations, a moderate freedom of the press, and the separation of religion and police.

Recent events would induce one to suppose that the enormous power of the press and of public opinion, which it forms and reflects, is not understood in Rome. In 1856 the Inquisitor at Ancona issued an edict, threatening with the heaviest censures all who should omit to denounce the religious or ecclesiastical faults of their neighbours, relatives, or superiors; and in defiance of the general indignation, and of the despondency of those who, for the sake of religion, desired reforms in the States of the Church, the *Civiltà Cattolica* declared that the Inquisitor had done his duty. Such cases as this, and those of Achilli and Mortara, weighed more heavily in the scale in which the Roman State is weighed than a lost battle. Without discussing the cases themselves, it is clear what their influence has been on public opinion, with which it is more important at the present day to treat than with the governments which depend on it. This branch of diplomacy has been unfortunately neglected, and hence the Roman government cannot rely on lay support.

After describing the evils and disorders of the State, which the Pope so deeply felt that he put his own existence in peril, and inflamed half of Europe with the spirit of radical change, in the attempt to remove them, Dr. Döllinger contrasts, with the gloomy picture of decay and failure, the character of the Pontiff who attempted the great work of reform.

“Nevertheless, the administration of Pius IX. is wise, benevolent, indulgent, thrifty, attentive to useful institutions and improvements. All that proceeds from Pius IX. personally is worthy of a Head of the Church—elevated, liberal in the best sense of the term. No sovereign spends less on his court and his own private wants. If all thought and acted as he does, his would be a model state. Both the French and the English envoys affirm that the financial administration had improved, that the value of the land was increasing, agriculture flourishing, and that many symptoms of progress might be observed. Whatever can be expected of a monarch full of affection for his people, and seeking his sole recreation in works of beneficence, Pius richly performs. *Pertransiit benefaciendo*,—words used of one far greater,—are simply the truth applied to him. In him we can clearly perceive how the Papacy, even as a temporal state, might, so far as the character of the prince is concerned, through judicious elections, be the most admirable of human institutions. A man in the prime of life, after an irreproachable youth and a conscientious discharge of episcopal duties, is elevated to the highest dignity and to sovereign power. He knows nothing of expensive amusements; he has no other passion but that of doing good, no other am-

bition but to be beloved by his subjects. His day is divided between prayer and the labours of government; his relaxation is a walk in the garden, a visit to a church, a prison, or a charitable institution. Free from personal desires and from terrestrial bonds, he has no relatives, no favourites to provide for. For him the rights and powers of his office exist only for the sake of its duties. . . . Grievously outraged, injured, rewarded with ingratitude, he has never harboured a thought of revenge, never committed an act of severity, but ever forgiven and ever pardoned. The cup of sweetness and of bitterness, the cup of human favour and of human aversion, he has not only tasted, but emptied to the dregs; he heard them cry 'Hosanna!' and soon after 'Crucifige!' The man of his confidence, the first intellectual power of his nation, fell beneath the murderer's knife; the bullet of an insurgent struck down the friend by his side. And yet no feeling of hatred, no breath of anger could ever obscure, even for a moment, the spotless mirror of his soul. Untouched by human folly, unmoved by human malice, he proceeds with a firm and regular step on his way, like the stars of heaven.

Such I have seen the action of this Pope in Rome, such it has been described to me by all, whether near him or afar; and if he now seems to be appointed to pass through all the painful and discouraging experience which can befall a monarch, and to continue to the end the course of a prolonged martyrdom, he resembles in this, as in so many other things, the Sixteenth Louis; or rather, to go up higher, he knows that the disciple is not above the Master, and that the pastor of a church, whose Lord and Founder died upon the cross, cannot wonder and cannot refuse that the cross should be laid also upon him." (pp. 624-627.)

It is a common opinion, that the Pope, as a sovereign, is bound by the canon law to the forms and ideas of the middle ages; and that in consequence of the progress of society, of the difference between the thirteenth century and the nineteenth, there is an irreconcilable discord between the Papacy and the necessities of civil government. All Catholics are bound to oppose this opinion. Only that which is of Divine institution is unchangeable through all time. But the sovereignty of the Popes is extremely elastic, and has already gone through many forms. No contrast can be stronger than between the use which the Popes made of their power in the thirteenth or the fifteenth century, and the system of Consalvi. There is no reason, therefore, to doubt, that it will now, after a violent interruption, assume the form best adapted to the character of the age and the requirements of the Italian people. There is nothing chimerical in the vision of a new order of things, in which the election shall fall on men in the prime of their years and

their strength; in which the people shall be reconciled to their government by free institutions and a share in the conduct of their own concerns, and the upper classes satisfied by the opening of a suitable career in public affairs. Justice publicly and speedily administered would obtain the confidence of the people; the public service would be sustained by an honourable *esprit de corps*; the chasm between laity and priesthood would be closed by equality in rights and duties; the police would not rely on the help of religion, and religion would no longer drag itself along on the crutches of the police. The integrity of the Papal States would be under the joint guardianship of the Powers, who have guaranteed even the dominions of the Sultan; and the Pope would have no enemies to fear, and his subjects would be delivered from the burden of military service and of a military budget.

Religious liberty is not, as the enemies of the Holy See declare, and some even of its friends believe, an insurmountable difficulty. Events often cut the knots which appear insoluble to theory. Attempts at proselytising have not hitherto succeeded among the subjects of the Pope; but if it had been otherwise, would it have been possible for the Inquisition to proceed against a Protestant? The agitation that must have ensued would be a welcome opportunity to put an end to what remains of the temporal power. It is true that the advance of Protestantism in Italy would raise up a barrier between the Pope and his subjects; but no such danger is to be apprehended. At the time when the doctrines of the Reformation exercised an almost magical power over mankind, they never took root in Italy beyond a few men of letters; and now that their power of attraction and expansion has long been exhausted, neither Sardinian policy nor English gold will succeed in seducing the Italians to them.

The present position of helpless and humiliating dependence will not long endure. The determination of the Piedmontese government to annex Rome is not more certain than the determination of the Emperor Napoleon to abrogate the temporal power. Pius IX. would enjoy greater security in Turkey than in the hands of a State which combines the tyranny of the Convention, the impudent sophistry of a government of advocates, and the ruthless brutality of military despotism. Rather than trust to Piedmont, may Pius IX. remember the example of his greatest predecessors, who, relying on the spiritual might of the Papacy, sought beyond the Alps the freedom which Italy denied to them.

The Papacy has beheld the rise and the destruction of many thrones, and will assuredly outlive the kingdom of Italy, and other monarchies besides. It can afford to wait; *patiens quia æternus*. The Romans need the Pope more than the Pope needs Rome. Above the Catacombs, among the Basilicas, beside the Vatican, there is no place for a tribune or for a king. We shall see what was seen in the fourteenth century: envoys will come from Rome to entreat the Pope to return to his faithful city.

Whilst things continue as they are, the emperor can, by threatening to withdraw his troops, compel the Pope to consent to any thing not actually sinful. Such a situation is alarming in the highest degree for other countries. But for the absolute confidence that all men have in the fidelity and conscientiousness of the present Pope, and for the providential circumstance that there is no ecclesiastical complication which the French government could use for its own ends, it would not be tolerated by the rest of the Catholic world. Sooner or later these conditions of security will disappear, and the interest of the Church demands that before that happens, the peril should be averted, even by a catastrophe.

The hostility of the Italians themselves to the Holy See is the tragic symptom of the present malady. In other ages when it was assailed, the Italians were on its side, or at least were neutral. Now they require the destruction of the temporal power, either as a necessary sacrifice for the unity and greatness of their country, or as a just consequence of incurable defects. The time will come, however, when they will be reconciled with the Papacy, and with its presence as a power among them. It was the dependence of the Pope on the Austrian arms, and his identification in popular opinion with the cause of the detested foreigner, that obscured his lofty position as the moral bulwark and protector of the nation. For 1500 years the Holy See was the pivot of Italian history, and the source of the Italian influence in Europe. The nation and the See shared the same fortunes, and grew powerful or feeble together. It was not until the vices of Alexander VI. and his predecessors had destroyed the reverence which was the protection of Italy, that she became the prey of the invaders. None of the great Italian historians has failed to see that they would ruin themselves in raising their hands against Rome. The old prophecy of the Papa Angelico, of an Angel Pope, who was to rise up to put an end to discord and disorder, and to restore piety and peace and happiness in Italy, was but the significant token

of the popular belief that the Papacy and the nation were bound up together, and that one was the guardian of the other. That belief slumbers, now that the idea of unity prevails, whilst the Italians are attempting to put the roof on a building without walls and without foundations; but it will revive again, when centralisation is compelled to yield to federalism, and the road to the practicable has been found in the search after impossibilities.

The tyrannical character of the Piedmontese government, its contempt for the sanctity of public law, the principles on which it treats the clergy at home, and the manner in which it has trampled on the rights of the Pope and the interests of religion, the perfidy and despotism it exhibits, render it impossible that any securities it may offer to the Pope can possess a real value. Moreover, in the unsettled state of the kingdom, the uncertain succession of parties, and the fluctuation of power, whatever guarantee is proposed by the ministry, there is nobody to guarantee the guarantor. It is a system without liberty and without stability; and the Pope can never be reconciled to it, or become a dweller in the new Italian kingdom.

If he must choose between the position of a subject and of an exile, he is at home in the whole Catholic world, and wherever he goes he will be surrounded by children who will greet him as their father. It may become an inevitable, but it must always be a heroic resolution. The court and the various congregations for the administration of the affairs of the Church are too numerous to be easily moved. In former times the machinery was more simple, and the whole body of the pontifical government could be lodged in a single French monastery. The absence of the Pope from Rome will involve great difficulties and annoyance; but it is a lesser evil than a surrender of principle, which cannot be recalled.

To remove the Holy See to France would, under present circumstances, be an open challenge to a schism, and would afford to all who wish to curtail the papal rights, or to interrupt the communication between the Pope and the several Churches, the most welcome pretexts, and it would put arms in the hands of governments that wish to impede the action of his authority within their states.

The conclusion of the book is as follows:

“If the Court of Rome should reside for a time in Germany, the Roman prelates will doubtless be agreeably surprised to discover that our people is able to remain Catholic and religious without the leading-strings of a police, and that its religious sentiments are a

better protection to the Church than the episcopal *carceri*, which, thank God, do not exist. They will learn that the Church in Germany is able to maintain herself without the Holy Office; that our Bishops, although, or because, they use no physical compulsion, are revered like princes by the people, that they are received with triumphal arches, that their arrival in a place is a festival for the inhabitants. They will see how the Church with us rests on the broad, strong, and healthy basis of a well-organised system of pastoral administration and of popular religious instruction. They will perceive that we Catholics have maintained for years the struggle for the deliverance of the Church from the bonds of bureaucracy straightforwardly and without reservation; that we cannot entertain the idea of denying to the Italians what we have claimed for ourselves; and that therefore we are far from thinking that it is anywhere an advantage to fortify the Church with the authority of the police and with the power of the secular arm. Throughout Germany we have been taught by experience the truth of Fénelon's saying, that the spiritual power must be carefully kept separate from the civil, because their union is pernicious. They will find further, that the whole of the German clergy is prepared to bless the day when it shall learn that the free sovereignty of the Pope is assured, without sentence of death being still pronounced by ecclesiastics, without priests continuing to discharge the functions of treasury-clerks or police-directors, or to conduct the business of the lottery. And, finally, they will convince themselves that all the Catholics of Germany will stand up as one man for the independence of the Holy See, and the legitimate rights of the Pope; but that they are no admirers of a form of government of very recent date, which is, in fact, nothing else than the product of the mechanical polity of Napoleon combined with a clerical administration. And this information will bear good fruit when the hour shall strike for the return, and restitution shall be made. . . .

Meanwhile Pius IX. and the men of his council will 'think upon the days of old, and have in their minds the eternal years.' They will read the future in the earlier history of the Papacy, which has already seen many an exile and many a restoration. The example of the resolute, courageous Popes of the middle ages will light the way. It is no question now of suffering martyrdom, of clinging to the tombs of the Apostles, or of descending into the catacombs; but of quitting the land of bondage, in order to exclaim on a free soil, 'Our bonds are broken, and we are free!' For the rest God will provide, and the unceasing gifts and sympathies of the Catholic world. And the parties in Italy, when they have torn and exhausted the land which has become a battle-field; when the sobered and saddened people, tired of the rule of lawyers and of soldiers, has understood the worth of a moral and spiritual authority, then will be the time to think of returning to the Eternal City. In the interval, the things will have disappeared for whose preservation such pains are taken; and then there will be better reason than

Consalvi had, in the preface to the *motu proprio* of 6th July 1816, to say : ' Divine Providence, which so conducts human affairs that out of the greatest calamity innumerable benefits proceed, seems to have intended that the interruption of the papal government should prepare the way for a more perfect form of it.' "

We have written at a length for which we must apologise to our readers ; and yet this is but a meagre sketch of the contents of a book which deals with a very large proportion of the subjects that occupy the thoughts and move the feelings of religious men. We will attempt to sum up in a few words the leading ideas of the author. Addressing a mixed audience, he undertakes to controvert two different interpretations of the events which are being fulfilled in Rome. To the Protestants, who triumph in the expected downfall of the Papacy, he shows the consequence of being without it. To the Catholics, who see in the Roman question a great peril to the Church, he explains how the possession of the temporal sovereignty had become a greater misfortune than its loss for a time would be. From the opposite aspects of the religious camps of our age he endeavours to awaken the misgivings of one party, and to strengthen the confidence of the other. There is an inconsistency between the Protestant system and the progress of modern learning : there is none between the authority of the Holy See and the progress of modern society. The events which are tending to deprive the Pope of his territory are not to be therefore deplored, if we consider the preceding causes, because they made this catastrophe inevitable : still less if, looking to the future, we consider the state of Protestantism, because they remove an obstacle to union which is humanly almost insurmountable. In a former work Döllinger exhibited the moral and intellectual exhaustion of Paganism, as the prelude to Christianity. In like manner he now confronts the dissolution and spiritual decay of Protestantism with the Papacy. But in order to complete the contrast, and give force to the vindication, it was requisite that the true function and character of the Holy See should not be concealed from the unpractised vision of strangers, by the mask of that system of government which has grown up around it in modern times. The importance of this violent disruption of the two authorities consists in the state of religion throughout the world. Its cause lies in the deficiencies of the temporal power ; its end, in the mission of the spiritual.

The interruption of the temporal sovereignty is the only way we can discern in which these deficiencies can be remedied, and these ends obtained. But this interruption

cannot be prolonged. In an age in which the State throughout the Continent is absolute, and tolerates no immunities; when corporations have therefore less freedom than individuals, and the disposition to restrict their action increases in proportion to their power, the Pope cannot be independent as a subject. He must therefore be a sovereign, the free ruler of an actual territory, protected by international law and a European guarantee. The restoration consequently is necessary, though not as an immediate consequence of the revolution. In this revolutionary age the protection of the Catholic powers is required against outward attack. They must also be our security that no disaffection is provoked within; that there shall be no recurrence of the dilemma between the right of insurrection against an arbitrary government and the duty of obedience to the Pope; and that civil society shall not again be convulsed, nor the pillars of law and order throughout Europe shaken, by a revolution against the Church, of which, in the present instance, the conservative powers share the blame, and have already felt the consequences.

In the earnest and impressive language of the conclusion, in which Döllinger conveys the warnings which all Transalpine Catholicism owes to its Head as an Italian sovereign, it seems to us that something more definite is intended than the expression of the wish, which almost every Catholic feels, to receive the Pope in his own country. The anxiety for his freedom which would be felt if he took refuge in France, would be almost equally justified by his presence in Austria. A residence in an exclusively Catholic country, such as Spain, would be contrary to the whole spirit of this book, and to the moral which it inculcates, that the great significance of the crisis is in the state of German Protestantism. If the position of the Catholics in Germany would supply useful lessons and examples to the Roman court, it is also from the vicinity of the Protestant world that the full benefit can best be drawn from its trials, and that the crimes of the Italians, which have begun as calamities, may be turned to the advantage of the Church. But against such counsels there is a powerful influence at work. Napoleon has declared his determination to sweep away the temporal power. The continuance of the occupation of Rome, and his express prohibition to the Piedmontese government to proceed with the annexation during the life of the present Pope, signify that he calculates on greater advantages in a Conclave than from the patient resolution of Pius IX. This policy is supported by the events in Italy in a formidable manner. The

more the Piedmontese appear as enemies and persecutors, the more the emperor will appear as the only saviour; and the dread of a prolonged exile in any Catholic country, and of dependence for subsistence on the contributions of the faithful, must exhibit in a fascinating light the enjoyment of the splendid hospitality and powerful protection of France. On these hopes and fears, and on the difficulties which are pressing on the Cardinals from the loss of their revenues, the emperor speculates, and persuades himself that he will be master of the next election. On the immovable constancy of her Supreme Pontiff the Catholic Church unconditionally relies; and we are justified in believing that, in an almost unparalleled emergency, he will not tremble before a resolution of which no Pope has given an example since the consolidation of the temporal power.

THE EDUCATION COMMISSION.*

IF in any condition of society the Catholic could remain indifferent to questions directly affecting the welfare of the labouring classes, in Great Britain at least self-interest unites with religion to render such indifference impossible. Here these questions are our own, for we are of the labouring classes. The aristocratic element—proportionately considerable, and even predominant before emancipation—wastes away. Death, defection, extravagance, and exclusiveness create a vacuum which, with other religious bodies, new families rush in to supply. To us neither arts nor arms, neither army, navy, law, literature, nor even commerce, bring notable accessions of rank or wealth. Deprived of a common culture, we cannot compete successfully in the public arena; and thus, exhausted by the natural processes of decay, and unsupported by invigorating influences, we tend towards extinction rather than rejuvenescence. The conquests of the Faith by conversion resist the tendency, but do not stay it. The symptoms may be obscured, but the cause is not removed; and a fitful and irregular modification applies no permanent relief to a chronic malady. Meantime, while the higher orders suffer diminution, the increase of the labour-

* Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State of Popular Education in England. Six vols. 8vo. 1861.

ing class has been prodigious. In 1851 the Registrar-General computed the number of Irish-born residents among us at 1,000,000; and the natural increase of a prolific race, recruited by continuous immigration, cannot fail in the decade just closed to have produced a very large addition. Thus the Celtic element in the English Catholic body preponderates over the Saxon, and characterises the whole.

Upon the condition of the Irish immigrants it is needless to dwell at length. Suffice it to say, that their moral and intellectual qualities formed a marked contrast to their social position. They were at once the best and the lowest of the people. Driven by want from home and agricultural pursuits, and herded in the meanest quarters of all large towns, whatever of labour's tasks was hardest and worst paid, that they undertook to perform. Thus maintaining a daily contest with material ills, and lost to the saving influence of public opinion, they could not preserve unsullied the virtues of the Irish character. Their children, above all, were exposed to a wretched fate. Reared in the impure atmosphere of murky cities, and too often wanting the counsels and aids of religion, they possessed neither the hardy constitution nor the lively faith of their fathers. Feeble and emaciated in frame, seduced by vice and crime, their existence seemed as hopeless as it was miserable.

Among social questions, then, all of which should interest Catholics deeply, none presses more importunately for consideration than the method of dealing with the young. The old question of education remains ever new and attractive to each succeeding generation. But when the professors of a particular creed belong in overwhelming numbers to the labouring classes, and when plain and undeniable considerations manifest that the children of labourers are growing to be different from their fathers in character and habits, then surely the condition and training of youth rise into unusual and paramount importance. It is because we are numerous and poor that English Catholics, apart from the fortuitous incentives of personal ambition and the blinding confusion of foreign intricacies, can never seriously adopt principles which overlook the cause and interests of the many, and while pampering the few—*fruges consumere natos*—condemn the working swarm to ignorance and degradation. Religion and policy alike forbid it.

It has been said, and with an appearance of truth, that Catholics are peculiarly sensitive and thin-skinned. Encompassed by foes who seem bent on detraction, we defend ourselves by for ever blowing the trumpet of self-laudation.

Our shouts of praise, however, seldom reach the enemy, and still more rarely move him, while they deafen and enervate ourselves. Two lies will not make truth, any more than two wrongs make right. A bold candour, perhaps, would show more wisdom and attain greater success. It might deliver us from some tyranny both without and within.

Quoi ! je souffrirai, moi, qu'un eagit de critique
Vienne usurper céans un pouvoir tyrannique ?

It is not invariably prudent to contradict the statements of well-informed opponents, or to yield to the acrimony of petulant friends. Moderate pretensions and a firm attitude win more respect than inflated estimates or cowardly concession.

The Report of the Royal Commission on Popular Education deserves attentive notice. It affords glimpses of the national estimate of Catholics ; it treats of subjects of momentous interest ; and it has revolutionised the system of Government grants to primary schools. We propose to make our readers acquainted with its bearing upon these subjects.

The value and the neglect of blue-books are proverbial. The strenuous idleness of the age is gratified by the laborious collection of information, while its fear of change and love of compromise shrink from acting upon the materials collected. Who would rest content without a searching inquiry into popular education, and a thousand other questions, all at the public expense ? and how many will investigate the results ?

The Commission to inquire into the present state of popular education in England, and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people, was issued by royal authority upon the 30th of June 1858 to the Duke of Newcastle, Sir John Coleridge, the Rev. W. C. Lake, the Rev. W. Rogers, Mr. Goldwin Smith, Mr. Nassau Senior, and Mr. Miall,—with power to call before them such persons as they should judge necessary ; to conduct the inquiry by all lawful ways and means, within all parts of England ; to administer oaths ; to demand the production of all records, books, and papers ; and to propose fitting regulations. They were to report within two years ; and all her Majesty's loving subjects whatsoever were commanded to be assistant in the execution of the Commission. Thus appointed, the Commissioners adopted a scientific method of inquiry. Setting aside whatever was already known, and whatever principles might have been taken as established,

they resolved to collect the facts afresh, as materials for a new and independent induction. Such an investigation, if extended over a large area, would have been encumbered by such an immense mass of bewildering details as to become utterly unmanageable. The Commissioners, therefore, determined to select ten circumscribed localities as specimens of the kingdom, and to collect all the educational phenomena displayed in them by means of ten assistants. The Assistant-Commissioners were required to dismiss from their minds all previous conclusions, and to confine themselves to the collection of facts touching the statistics, condition, methods, and results of education, without any controversial bias, ecclesiastical, political, or economical. Having thus obtained their premisses, the Commissioners reserved to themselves the task of generalising conclusions from them. Whether education is yet capable of this scientific treatment may be seriously questioned. The method was, at least, more philosophical than the attempts at deduction so much in favour with charlatans, who manufacture first principles at pleasure, and suppress their major premiss as often as convenience requires.

The specimen districts comprised two agricultural, two manufacturing, two mining, two maritime, and two metropolitan groups of population. Two Protestant clergymen, the Rev. T. Hedley and the Rev. J. Fraser, took certain agricultural parishes in Lincolnshire and adjoining counties on the east, and in Hereford and Dorset on the west. Bradford and Rochdale, assigned to Mr. Winder, and Dudley and the Potteries, examined by Mr. Coode, represented manufacturing England. Mr. Foster took the mining parts of Durham, and Mr. Jenkins Neath and Merthyr in Wales. For seaports, Bristol and Devonport were inspected by Mr. Cumin, and Hull, Yarmouth, and Ipswich by Mr. Hare. In the metropolis the examination extended over the unions of St. Pancras, St. George's-in-the-East, and Chelsea, by Mr. Wilkinson; and East London, St. George's Southwark, Newington, Wandsworth, St. Olave's Southwark, and St. Saviour's Southwark, by Dr. Hodgson. In addition to the employment of inspectors within the districts above numerated, the Commissioners freely circulated a paper of apposite questions among persons of all shades of opinion practically conversant with popular education, and they took the *vivá voce* evidence of several witnesses officially connected with the Committee of Council on Education and the Charity Commission. The educational societies of all denominations furnished the Commission with

statistical returns. Besides the various inquiries pursued in England, two Assistant-Commissioners, the Rev. M. Pattison and Mr. Matthew Arnold, were employed to report upon the system and state of education in Germany, France, Switzerland, and Holland.

The Commissioners report that "information was afforded to their assistants upon all the subjects of their inquiry by almost every one to whom they applied for that purpose, though they had no compulsory powers. The only exception of importance was in the case of the Roman Catholic schools, admission to which was uniformly refused." And they print their correspondence with the Catholic Poor-School Committee, which is curious and worth recording. Upon September 27, 1858, Mr. Stephen, having learnt from Mr. Allies that "if the Assistant-Commissioners were Protestants they would find a difficulty in obtaining admission into Roman Catholic schools," addressed an explanatory letter to the Hon. Charles Langdale, the universally-respected chairman of the Poor-School Committee, pointing out that "the only object which the Commissioners have in view is to obtain complete and accurate information upon the subject-matter of their inquiry. In order that they may be able to ascertain the number of persons for whom no education at all is provided, and to compare the working and results of different systems of education, it is absolutely necessary that the examination which they have undertaken should be local, and not denominational; and it is therefore manifestly necessary that many of the schools visited should be visited by persons who differ from their conductors in religious creed. The instructions of the Assistant-Commissioners enjoin upon them in the strongest way abstinence from any expression of controversial feeling." Mr. Langdale replied, on October 11, 1858, that the Catholic Poor-School Committee had "repeatedly stated why they would not admit any but Catholic inspectors to hold intercourse with their schools, and can see no reason for departing from their principles, then so clearly laid down as the only ones upon which Catholic schools could consent to avail themselves of the parliamentary grant for education. In the present inquiry, no Catholic representation has been admitted; and under the circumstances of such exclusion the Catholic Poor-School Committee must decline being a party to the proposed objects of the correspondence." Upon January 11, 1859, Mr. Langdale wrote again on behalf of the Poor-School Committee, "to state further that this refusal of coöperation extended to the cir-

culatation of the statistical inquiries, an answer to which, had they considered their interests to be fairly represented, they would most readily have endeavoured to procure." But between January and May—the dates are significant—a change had occurred. On the 9th of the latter month Mr. Langdale wrote for the third time, and in an altered tone. The matter had again been taken into consideration, and "the Committee, whilst adhering to the principle of admitting none but Catholic inspectors to inquire into their schools," now offer to "collect such information as may be afforded by replies to the circulars," and, upon the appointment of one or more Catholic Assistant-Commissioners, to give "admission to our schools, for the purpose of inquiry into the character of our secular instruction." They offer, also, to name qualified witnesses for examination, and to "give answers to any other questions which the Royal Commissioners might deem it expedient to ask." But the opportunity had already passed away, and the Committee was informed that the Assistant-Commissioners had concluded their inquiry, and that there was no present intention of examining witnesses. The offer of statistical information was accepted with thanks, and at this point the correspondence closes.

Thus excluded from Catholic schools, the Commissioners (like other men) had three courses open to them. They might have resolved to conduct the inquiry personally, and to have exercised the compulsory powers possessed by themselves, though not by their deputies. This course would have been highly inconvenient to an unpaid Commission, as well as foreign to modern practice, and generally offensive. Or they might have moved the Crown to issue a new Commission, overcoming the difficulty either by the conciliatory plan of including a Catholic Commissioner, or by the ruder process of extending power to assistants. Arbitrary and forcible entry into schools was not to be thought of, and it did not appear that conciliation was possible without an abandonment of the basis of impartial investigation. There remained the third course: to proceed with the inquiry independently of Catholic schools, which, as being of small moment in the Commissioners' eyes, might be omitted without injury to general conclusions; just as a geometrician suppresses the microscopic breadth of his lines without sacrificing the accuracy of his problems. Moreover, whatever in the conduct of Catholic schools was particularly deserving of remark, might readily be learnt in other countries, where the Poor-School Committee's insular principle had not penetrated. The loss,

if any, would fall on the English Catholics who had created the obstacle, and the Commissioners' Report would not on that account be less acceptable to the Protestant majority. If Catholics were misrepresented during the inquiry, or neglected in subsequent legislation, the responsibility would not rest with the Commissioners, whose assistants were as ready to visit Catholic schools in England as in France, and who obtained statistics from the Catholic Poor-School Committee, and evidence in writing, or *vivâ voce*, from Mr. Langdale, Mr. Allies, and Mr. T. W. Marshall.

The Commissioners' Report fills an octavo volume of 682 pages. Two volumes, of nearly equal bulk, contain the separate reports of the ten Assistant-Commissioners employed in England. The fourth volume, which is shorter, gives the reports upon education in France, Holland, Switzerland, and Germany, together with special reports upon educational charities, upon schools in Liverpool, and on training colleges. Then follow the answers to the Commissioners' circular of questions; and the series ends with a sixth volume, giving the minutes of evidence taken before them. It is to the notices, direct or incidental, of Catholic schools scattered throughout this voluminous Report that we shall confine our attention in the present article.

The statistics, if accurate, would have possessed high value; but as they were collected by religious societies through local agents, variously moved either by exaggeration or contempt, they can be regarded only as an approximation to the facts. Perhaps careless omissions on one side may be balanced by excessive estimates on the other; and it is remarkable that the Commissioners themselves possessed, or incidentally acquired, information about Catholic schools in two counties,—Derby and Hereford,—returned to them by the Poor-School Committee as containing no Catholic schools at all. They give, however, the nearest approach to accuracy which we are likely to obtain for many years to come, and, as fixing even roughly the numbers and distribution of Catholic school-children in a particular year, deserve to be recorded for future reference and comparison.

PUBLIC WEEK-DAY SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARS IN COUNTIES.

| COUNTY. | Returned to Commissioners, 1858. | | | | Inspected by Privy Council, 1859. | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| | Day-Schools. | | Night-Schools. | | Day-Schools. | | Night-Schools. | |
| | Rooms. | Children. | Rooms | Children. | Rooms. | Children. | Rooms. | Children. |
| Bedford . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Berks . . . | 5 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 1 | — | 0 | 0 |
| Bucks . . . | 1 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cambridge . . | 2 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cheshire . . . | 13 | 1,427 | 6 | 1,572 | 16 | 1,616 | 8 | 1,254 |
| Cornwall . . . | 5 | 261 | 1 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cumberland . . | 5 | 620 | 1 | 48 | 4 | 352 | 0 | 0 |
| Derby . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 404 | 0 | 0 |
| Devon . . . | 5 | 352 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 232 | 0 | 0 |
| Dorset . . . | 2 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Durham . . . | 17 | 2,322 | 7 | 202 | 8 | 918 | 0 | 0 |
| Essex . . . | 8 | 296 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gloucester . . | 15 | 1,511 | 3 | 106 | 5 | 509 | 0 | 0 |
| Hampshire . . | 18 | 850 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hereford . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hertford . . . | 2 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Huntingdon . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kent . . . | 18 | 1,826 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 437 | 0 | 0 |
| Lancaster . . . | 200 | 27,585 | 48 | 4,787 | 142 | 16,623 | 31 | 3,188 |
| Leicester . . . | 3 | 208 | 1 | 40 | 1 | 125 | 0 | 0 |
| Lincoln . . . | 2 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middlesex . . . | 117 | 15,574 | 5 | 266 | 54 | 6,948 | 2 | — |
| Monmouth . . . | 4 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Norfolk . . . | 7 | 322 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northampton . | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northumberland | 15 | 3,016 | 4 | 373 | 12 | 1,591 | 0 | 0 |
| Nottingham . . | 4 | 772 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 413 | 3 | 173 |
| Oxford . . . | 5 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 87 | 0 | 0 |
| Rutland . . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salop . . . | 3 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 133 | 0 | 0 |
| Somerset . . . | 11 | 532 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 112 | 0 | 0 |
| Stafford . . . | 42 | 4,237 | 5 | 143 | 18 | 1,674 | 0 | 0 |
| Suffolk . . . | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Surrey . . . | 34 | 3,512 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1,125 | 0 | 0 |
| Sussex . . . | 7 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 269 | 0 | 0 |
| Warwick . . . | 32 | 3,287 | 8 | 642 | 17 | 1,437 | 0 | 0 |
| Westmoreland . | 1 | 58 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wilts . . . | 3 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Worcester . . . | 9 | 511 | 1 | 22 | 1 | 90 | 1 | — |
| York . . . | 60 | 6,900 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 3,087 | 0 | 0 |
| Isle of Man . . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Denbigh . . . | 1 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Flint . . . | 6 | 425 | 1 | 14 | 6 | 335 | 0 | 0 |
| Glamorgan . . . | 6 | 989 | 2 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Welsh Counties . . } | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

We have been at the pains to show not only the number and distribution of Catholic schools and scholars as recorded by the latest public authority, but in each county we have contrasted the whole number both of day-schools and night-schools with the number receiving Government aid, because at the time when the plan of administering the parliamentary grant for education is about to undergo fundamental changes, it becomes of interest to examine how far the Minutes of 1846, as devised by Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, have succeeded in pervading the public-school system of the kingdom. Out of 690 school-rooms, with an attendance of 79,771, inspection seems to have reached 38,517 scholars, in 351 schools, leaving unassisted the education of one half of the whole number of children in Catholic day-schools. Nearly the same proportion is observed in night-schools, of which 44, with 4615 scholars, obtain grants out of a total of 8413 attending 96 schools. In deference to ecclesiastical authority, we re-arrange the figures under the Catholic dioceses.

| DIOCESE.* | Returned to Commissioners, 1858 | | | | Inspected by Privy Council, 1859. | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| | Day-Schools. | | Night-Schools. | | Day-Schools. | | Night-Schools. | |
| | Rooms. | Children. | Rooms. | Children. | Rooms. | Children. | Rooms. | Children. |
| Westminster | 127 | 15,934 | 5 | 266 | 54 | 6,948 | 0 | 0 |
| Beverley . | 60 | 6,900 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 3,087 | 0 | 0 |
| Birmingham | 88 | 8,256 | 14 | 807 | 38 | 3,288 | 0 | 0 |
| Clifton . . | 29 | 2,259 | 3 | 106 | 7 | 621 | 0 | 0 |
| Hexham . | 38 | 6,016 | 13 | 645 | 24 | 2,861 | 0 | 0 |
| Liverpool & Salford .) | 200 | 27,585 | 48 | 4,787 | 142 | 16,623 | 31 | 3,188 |
| Newport . . | 10 | 1,449 | 3 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northampton | 12 | 496 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nottingham. | 9 | 1,098 | 1 | 40 | 11 | 942 | 3 | 173 |
| Plymouth . | 12 | 732 | 1 | 54 | 3 | 232 | 0 | 0 |
| Shrewsbury | 23 | 2,063 | 7 | 1,586 | 24 | 2,084 | 8 | 1,254 |
| Southwark . | 82 | 6,983 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1,831 | 0 | 0 |
| | 690 | 79,771 | 96 | 8,413 | 351 | 38,517 | 44 | 4,615 |

If the scholars in Catholic schools bear the same proportion to the whole Catholic population as the attendance in public week-day schools bears to the population of England, and if all the children in Catholic schools are Catholics, we

* There are 53 additional Catholic schools, but the returns presented to the Commissioners do not specify the counties to which they belong. The attendance was stated to be 6095 children.

shall get the following results : the Catholic inhabitants of England and Wales would number 1,000,339 ; and of these, so far as the localities and attendance of schools are ascertained, there would reside in the dioceses of Liverpool and Salford, 321,365 ; in Westminster, 185,631 ; in Birmingham, 96,182 ; in Southwark, 81,352 ; in Beverley, 80,385 ; in Hexham, 70,086 ; in Clifton, 26,317 ; in Shrewsbury, 23,034 ; in Newport, 16,881 ; in Nottingham, 12,791 ; in Plymouth, 8528 ; and in Northampton, 5778. If in any diocese the low numbers so obtained should create surprise and incredulity, it may be inferred that (so far as the Poor-School Committee's returns are exact) the Catholic children of such localities are not adequately supplied with means of education in Catholic schools.

Of the public week-day schools ascertained to exist in England, Catholics support 5·52 in every 100, of Sunday-schools 1·5, and of night-schools 4·76. Such is the general result of the returns. With regard to Protestant schools of all or no denominations, the answers of the various educational societies were tested by minute inquiries in the specimen districts ; but, for the reason already given, this test failed in its application to Catholic schools. Thus Mr. Fraser reports, that "the managers of the Roman Catholic schools refused all information, on the ground that the Commission was unfairly constituted as respects them, by not including any representative of Roman Catholic opinions." And Mr. Winder : "The managers of the Catholic public schools, acting under central orders, alone refused to give information, or to admit me to their schools ; with this exception every school, both public and private, was opened to me." And Mr. Coode : "Throughout the whole inquiry, I have received the ready and even zealous assistance of all classes of persons, and the most free and, as far as I could judge, unreserved statements of facts and expressions of opinion from all persons in any way connected with public schools, with one class-exception only, namely, that of the managers and schoolmasters, mistresses and teachers, of Roman Catholic schools. As to the latter, it is probable that the masters and mistresses and teachers would in all cases—certainly they would in some—have willingly afforded me information, had they not been forbidden by the priest who had the management of the school. Mr. Tyson, the Roman Catholic priest at Sedgley, courteously afforded me the information I desired. . . . I took steps to obtain the information refused in the best way open to me, by the oral report of scholars, of teachers, or of neighbours, who

undertook to make a careful observation and enumeration of the matters in question, all of which I checked by counter information, and by observation on the spot at the time of going to and from school, and in some instances, in the case of Roman Catholic schools, by actual observation of myself and clerks within the schools." Mr. Coode, in short, has a taste for playing the spy. With more grace Mr. Foster: "In two instances, one Protestant, the other Roman Catholic, there was some *ex post facto* displeasure expressed by the patrons of schools because I had obtained information in their absence, and therefore necessarily without their previous concurrence. With these exceptions, my way was every where smooth. The Roman Catholics met me with the greatest politeness, and expressed their regret that the imperative orders of their superiors rendered it impossible for them to give me the required information. With respect to their schools, I was able to obtain very little except the number of children,—a number so small as not perceptibly to affect the general results." To a Roman Catholic lady writing about a school under her management, which she wished him to see, the same gentleman ascribes the smart remark, that "the religious instruction there given was devotional and practical, and did not consist, as in the Protestant schools, of inculcating the exact number of kings that reigned in Israel, or the precise names of Jacob's sons." Again, Mr. Cumin: "The clergy of the Established Church, the Dissenting ministers, the laymen interested in education, and, with few exceptions, the masters of private schools, filled them (forms) up with care and alacrity. The Roman Catholics formed the only exception to this general rule. The masters of such schools in my district declined to receive the forms, or to allow me to enter their schoolrooms officially; and her Majesty's Roman Catholic Inspector, Mr. Marshall, also declined to coöperate or aid in the inquiry." Subsequently, as we shall see further on, Mr. Marshall gave very interesting evidence before the Commission. A pleasant incident, creditable as far as it goes to Roman Catholic teaching, is recorded by Mr. Cumin with a touch of pathos. "I visited the City Library at Bristol in the evening. . . . One boy, very pale and emaciated, but with a beautiful countenance, I stopped. He was a Roman Catholic. His mother received parish relief,—four loaves and two shillings. He attended the Roman Catholic school. I asked him to write from my dictation. He wrote, 'John Terry, No. 5 Upper Lamb Street,—You will endeavour to ascertain,' in a good round hand. The orthography was

correct. He was only twelve." To a statement in the body of his Report that "the managers and teachers of the Roman Catholic schools courteously but peremptorily declined to give me any information concerning them," the next Assistant-Commissioner, Mr. Hare, appends a note: "I received some information as to the number of Roman Catholic schools, the attendance, and other circumstances, but not in a form sufficiently authentic to be reported. In Hull and Sealcoates there are two boys' and two girls' day-schools of the elementary class assisted and inspected, a school of a superior class for girls, and two evening-schools free, besides two sets of Sunday-schools. In Yarmouth there are a day-school and a mixed Sunday-school. In Ipswich I did not hear of any school at all." Of the metropolitan districts, Mr. Wilkinson reports: "In no single instance did I meet with actual hostility or want of politeness. The masters and superintendents of Roman Catholic schools expressed their regret that they were prohibited by the orders of their superiors from giving information. . . . I have been unable to obtain information with respect to the number of scholars in Roman Catholic schools sufficiently authentic to justify me in adding them to my tables; . . . and the information I received orally upon the subject differed so materially from my own observation, that I do not venture to include them in my calculation upon so insufficient data." A foot-note explains: "At St. George's-in-the-East I was informed by the superintending priest that there were from 1800 to 2000 Roman Catholic children at the public schools in the parish. There is a very fine building erected immediately contiguous to the Protestant schools in St. Mary's district. But after giving full credit for this, which I went over, I could not satisfy myself that there were 1000 children in the parish under education. Possibly my informant put a different interpretation upon the word 'parish.' Mr. Marshall's Report gives 536 as the total present in 1853." It is a little remarkable that Mr. Wilkinson, whose Report is dated 1st October 1859, should have gone as far back as 1853 for his figures, unless (as, indeed, appears to have been the case with the Commissioners generally) he was ignorant of the existence of the Tabulated Reports upon individual schools issued from year to year by her Majesty's Inspectors. Mr. Marshall's Tabulated Reports for 1859 give the following numbers as present during inspection in May of that year: in Red Lion Street, Wapping, 200; in the East London School, 191; in Pell Street, St. George's-in-the-East, 454; and in John Street, Commercial Road, 535; making a total

of 1380 scholars in inspected schools. The attendance at other Roman Catholic schools would no doubt make up the number mentioned by the "superintending priest." Finally, Dr. Hodgson enters "thirteen Roman Catholic schools, from none of which was any return received. The number of pupils in the Roman Catholic schools have been taken in most cases from the last-published Report (for 1857) of the Catholic Poor-School Committee; in a few cases it has been estimated from observation on the spot, or from information indirectly obtained. The numbers are probably under-estimated."

If the attendance has not been adequately represented, the financial returns submitted by Catholic schools are so manifestly incomplete as to be quite worthless. Thus the amount of endowment acknowledged by all the Catholic schools of the kingdom stands at 110%; while the whole income of all our schools in Middlesex, independent of Government aid, comes to no more than 300%. Catholic Lancashire avows the more respectable revenue of 4968*l.* 19*s.* From Yorkshire and several other counties no returns of income were received. Probably the inveterate habit of concealment, acquired in evil times, blinded managers to the altered circumstances of our day, when wills are all deposited for perusal, and a Board of Commissioners has jurisdiction over Catholic charities. Certainly the public will not gain a high appreciation of the liberality and love for education displayed by the great nobles, and the wealthy proprietors, and the million of commoners, whose accumulated gifts and bequests to Catholic schools for the poor produce the salary of a single schoolmaster. Had the money granted to Catholic schools by the English Government within the last twelve years been funded at four per cent, a revenue of upwards of 3300*l.* a year would have accrued; and the treasured liberality of three centuries of Catholics brings in no more than 110%! Accounts so plainly inexact cannot have been meant to deceive; and it would seem more judicious to withhold them altogether. The statistical clerks of the Royal Commission may—it is within the limits of possibility—have suppressed some of the returns, or otherwise reduced the figures. Explanation and apology should, if so, be sternly demanded. It is no light matter that doubt has been thrown upon the financial returns of Catholic school-managers at the very moment when they are about to be intrusted with the local administration of the Government grant for education.

Want of opportunity to visit and examine Catholic schools led the Assistant-Commissioners into an error which a li-

mitted experience would have served to dissipate. They seem to agree in reporting that, while Catholic children are found in Protestant schools, Protestant parents will not allow their sons to frequent the schools of Catholics. In all schools (Church, Wesleyan, and British) in Bradford and Rochdale, children of all denominations are mixed up together. Roman Catholics and Wesleyans, Churchmen and Independents, Baptists and Indifferents, sit at the same desks, and submit without remonstrance or disapproval to the prescribed religious routine. What is called the religious difficulty is unknown to the population of Durham and Cumberland, except in the case of the Roman Catholics, many of whom withhold their children from Protestant schools, but this avowedly in obedience to their priests, and not of their own choice. "I have seen," says Mr. Cumin of Bristol and Plymouth, "the sons of Jews and Roman Catholics in Church schools, the sons of Churchmen attending a Church Sunday-school and a Unitarian week-day school. The mass of the poor have no notion as to any distinction beyond that between Roman Catholics and Protestants. In various conversations with workmen, I have often put the question whether they would object to send their children to a Church school though they were Dissenters, or to a Dissenting school though they were Churchmen. The answer has invariably been in the negative. Upon pursuing the inquiry further, I found that if there was none but a Roman Catholic school in the neighbourhood, *they would send them to no school at all!*" And Mr. Coode reports of the Potteries that "the genuine, unstimulated opinion of the lower classes of parents who desire education for their children appears to me to be universally a simple desire for a good, useful, plain education, with little care about religious distinctions of doctrine or discipline, except only so far that Protestant parents of all classes avoid the Roman Catholic schools, and Roman Catholic parents nearly as generally avoid Protestant schools of all denominations." Of Hull, Yarmouth, and Ipswich, Mr. Hare speaks less positively: "Every where I have found Jews in Christian, and Roman Catholics in Protestant schools; Nonconformists in National schools, and Church children in British or positively Dissenting schools. The only Jews' school which I have discovered contained Jews alone; but" (he adds with astonishment) "I have evidence that the Roman Catholic schools in Hull are not without some mixture of Protestant children. With the mass of the people the question of religious belief rarely enters their heads in choosing or refusing a school. The Hull and Sealcoates witnesses make one ex-

ception. The Protestant feeling is strong in that town, yet neither so strong nor so unanimously represented as to prevent Roman Catholics from remaining in Protestant schools after the opening of schools of their own denomination, or Protestant children finding their way into schools managed by Roman Catholic priests and Sisters of Mercy. . . . The Roman Catholics in Ipswich take, ostensibly, no part in public education, while some of their children may be found in existing schools." The Hull Protestants, indeed, unless they are maligned, would furnish Mr. J. S. Mill with an apt illustration of middle-class notions of liberty ; for they cherish a "special opposition to the grant of public money to Roman Catholic schools as such." Probably the flourishing condition of the schools, and the number of Protestant children in them, excite this bilious antipathy. The liberality of practice, on the other hand, which private Catholic schools in London exhibit, cannot be justified even by the penury of their teachers. "The Church Catechism," says Mr. Wilkinson, "is the only recognised formulary in several Dissenting and in two Roman Catholic private schools ; not that it was pressed upon the scholars, but it was the only catechism recognised." And he gives details from his experience :—as of Mr. C., an intelligent and capable master, who keeps a large boys' school in a dirty building, and has six or seven Roman Catholics, Jews, and Dissenters among his scholars. He uses the Church Catechism, but does not force it. And again of Mrs. D., who, in a respectable school at 6*d.* a week, has three Roman Catholic children removed from the Catholic schools. They learn Church Catechism, parents not objecting. She has seven Jews, who do not come on Saturday. Also Mrs. N., ten years schoolmistress, formerly in service as housekeeper, has Dissenters of all classes, Roman Catholics, and Jewesses among her scholars. The Church Catechism is her only class-book, but she does not teach it to them. Finally, we read of Mrs. O., who keeps a good school, and has all sorts of persuasions among her scholars. She sends to know if parents approve of Scripture being taught, and if not does not teach them. Her experience is, that religious differences are not at all regarded by parents ; but she complains that the Sisters of Mercy who have recently established a school near her, ascertained the names and residences of her children, and bribed many away from her to teach them for nothing. These examples are taken from one of the poor districts of St. Pancras, but they could be matched in other parishes. Most pitiful indeed is the description of a private school in London, sketched by Dr. Hodgson. "Mr. —.

Males, 12 ; females, 2. This school is held in probably the most miserable place I have yet seen, at the top of a very steep and broken staircase, and in a room more like a carpenter's shop than a schoolroom. It is impossible to describe the poverty and decay which every thing indicated. The chief text-book seemed to be a kitten, to which all the children were very attentive. The room is small and unventilated ; window dirty. Mr. — is a young man, very pale and sickly in appearance, born in this country ; a Roman Catholic, and most of his pupils, if not all, are of the same faith. Between school-hours he does carpenter's work at the desk and benches, which he is fitting up. He expressed a strong wish to have an arithmetic-book and a grammar, for his own improvement. I promised to send him both. His mother keeps a marine store on the ground-floor." Is there no one to seek out this pale and sickly young man in his wretched garret, with the view of helping him to something better than an arithmetic-book and a grammar ? But to return to our argument. One Commissioner, as we have seen, obtained evidence that the Roman Catholic schools in Hull are not without some mixture of Protestant children. Another, the Rev. J. Fraser, reports that "the Roman Catholic school at Belmont, near Hereford, admits the children of Protestant parents on the distinct pledge of not interfering with their religious opinions ; and there were Protestant children being instructed in the school of the same persuasion at Axminster." How, then, can Mr. Cumin, who was not allowed to enter the Catholic schools, dare to assert of the working-classes, that if there was none but a Roman Catholic school in the neighbourhood, they would send their children to no school at all ? or Mr. Coode, that Protestant parents of all classes avoid the Roman Catholic schools ?

The truth is, that the instructions to Assistant-Commissioners demanded more than the weakness of human nature can give. These gentlemen were morally unable to dismiss prejudices and conclusions from their minds. The two clergymen transparently reflect the views of their class ; another Commissioner is a philanthropist, for ever babbling of *his* schools and *his* charitable institutions ; a fourth is a philosopher, shocked at the exclusion of schools which teach only those great laws of Nature and Providence which all men, Protestant and Catholic, Trinitarian and Unitarian, Christian and Jew, alike recognise ; while of Mr. Cumin and Mr. Coode we will only say, that, having assuredly allowed themselves in this matter to be influenced by a controversial bias, so, in the words of their instructions, the value of their

investigations has been entirely destroyed: for, excluded from Catholic schools, and unable to obtain positive evidence, they take upon themselves to report the negative assertion that Protestant children do not attend Catholic schools, and rather than do so would go to no school at all. How many witnesses will establish this negative to Mr. Cumin's satisfaction? Is it not to his prepossession rather than to his evidence that he gives ear? They who have *not* been excluded from Catholic schools know well that Protestant children *are* often found in them. Mr. Marshall, her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, in one of his official reports to the Privy Council, truly affirms that "it very frequently happens, and especially in the midland and northern counties, that for various reasons,—sometimes from a notion that greater advantages are to be obtained, sometimes as a matter of convenience, and perhaps not unfrequently from mere caprice,—the parents of Protestant children are desirous that they should be instructed in a Catholic school. In a very few cases, and from particular causes, they even form the majority of the regular attendants." And in giving evidence before the Royal Commissioners, the same gentleman bears similar testimony. "*Mr. Rogers.* Do you find at all that in the good Roman Catholic schools Protestants are drawn in?—Not so much in London; first, perhaps, because the different denominations look after them too carefully; but I have seen schools which have been largely composed of Protestant children from that cause. *Mr. Rogers.* If the school is a good one, the parents do not regard the religious instruction, but only the goodness of the school?—They do not seem to care much about the religion one way or the other; but I know many country schools in which perhaps half the children are Protestants, entirely owing to the good character of the schools. The most remarkable case which I know is that of a large manufacturing town in Yorkshire, where, when I first visited the school, there was nothing remarkable in it, and there were fifty or sixty children; they have been obliged twice to more than double the size of it. It is not in my district. Two-thirds of the children are Protestants, who leave their own schools two miles behind, where they would pay nothing, and pay sixpence a week to us. They are admitted as a very great favour; for the manager told me that he never admitted them without keeping them waiting a month or two; and they pay sixpence or a shilling a week, from the notion which prevails that it is a very good school." Even Mr. Lingen, the Secretary of the Education Board, is able to acquaint the Commission, that

“with regard to girls, for whom the Roman Catholic schools provide excellent instruction, I have heard that Protestant girls are not unfrequently sent to Roman Catholic schools.” But the Barnsley School is not a girls’ but a boys’ school, and it is in evidence that two-thirds of the scholars are Protestants, attracted by the excellence of the instruction, and seeking admission as a high favour in preference to schools of their own.

We have, then, this array of facts. Wherever the Assistant-Commissioners, all but universally shut out of Catholic schools, got admission to them, or obtained information, as at Belmont, Axminster, and Hull, there they found and reported the presence of Protestant scholars. Her Majesty’s Inspector has attested that Protestant parents are frequently desirous of sending their children to Catholic schools, that in a few cases the Protestant children even form the majority, and in a special instance two-thirds, of the attendants. Moreover, the Privy Council is aware of the circumstance and its explanation. Yet Mr. Cumin, after conversations with two or three, or (shall we say ?) a dozen workmen, has the temerity to assert the universal negative that Protestant parents will not send their children to Catholic schools, and if there were none but a Roman Catholic school in the neighbourhood, would send them to no school at all !

And Mr. Coode makes the same assertion of the Potteries, that Protestant parents of all classes avoid the Catholic schools. There is no district in England where the working-man displays more independence of conduct, and less subservience to clerical influences, than in the Staffordshire Potteries. The Catholic schools are fairly numerous and flourishing, with an estimated attendance of nearly 1000 scholars. The popularity and liberal practice of a deceased priest led, in one particular district, to the Catholic baptism of large numbers of the children of Protestant parents. We believe that the announcement of a sermon by Father Faber or Dr. Northcote would at any time fill the largest church in the Potteries with an audience half Protestant. That in such a population the Protestant parents of all classes should avoid the Roman Catholic schools, would be a striking fact indeed. But we are informed the fact is far otherwise. Up to the time of Mr. Coode’s inquiry, there had been for some years at Cobridge a Catholic boys’ school of high repute, and largely attended by Protestant children, in consideration for whom lessons were not suspended on days of obligation. In the Catholic boys’ school at Longton, we are told that a third of the scholars are Protestants, and

that want of accommodation alone limits their number. But, not to multiply needless proofs, it is manifest that, without visiting the Catholic schools, Mr. Coode has ventured on an assertion which could only be made with truth after a diligent examination of them.

The general question is of no slight importance ; for if Protestant parents really withhold their children every where from Catholic schools, one or both of two causes must be in operation. Either Catholic schools must be so badly conducted and poorly taught as to offer no attractions to scholars ; or the principles and practices of the Catholic religion must be so universally abhorred as in all cases to overcome the attractions of a good education ; or Catholics have no good schools, and if they had, are too generally hated to draw scholars to them. Assuming some such first principle as this, the two Assistant-Commissioners readily conclude that Protestant children never attend Catholic schools ; but in thus arguing they must be allowed to have violated the first condition of their appointment, and to have proved themselves quite unqualified for the patient conduct of a delicate investigation.

Mr. Coode's description of Catholicity in Dudley will illustrate his animus. "The Roman Catholic body here," he says, "includes no gentry, nor persons of the middle rank, but consists wholly of the lowest class of labourers, very few of whom are permanent residents, and whom their clergy, with few exceptions, of which the late priest Mr. Moore was a very worthy one, keep jealously separate from all efforts in which the other religious bodies take, as religious communities, any part. The repulsion appears to be reciprocal ; for the other parties display very little of that tolerance towards the Roman Catholics that otherwise so honourably distinguishes the conduct both of ministers and flocks towards one another. The Roman Catholic labourers very generally perform the very rudest part in all labours in which they are engaged. They work together, resort to the same quarter, the worst in the town, and to the same places of amusement, and generally, whether for good or ill, neither much influence nor are influenced by the work-people of other creeds, while all these are mingled in their dwellings, in their work, and in their amusements, without distinction of creed. Under the circumstances of the Roman Catholic population resorting to Dudley, it was scarcely possible to effect much for the school education of their children. A Roman Catholic school at Sedgley is in a somewhat better condition ; but the difficulty found in Dudley in edu-

cating the Roman Catholic population is nearly the same here."

The assumption, disguised as an inference, that Catholic schools neither deserve nor obtain the attendance of any children not Catholics, would lead to a practical conclusion of serious injustice. For in the case of new Catholic schools to be built with Government aid, if only Catholics will ever seek education therein, then, in assigning a grant, it becomes the duty of the Privy Council to make precise inquiries into the number of Catholic children in the locality, and, further, to investigate whether Catholics are there a growing or diminishing body. Minute inquiries of this kind are needless when the fact has been acknowledged that well-conducted Catholic schools, if not filled by Catholic children or rendered exclusive by some local peculiarity, every where secure the attendance of a certain number of Protestant children. Any surplusage of room is so much gained for general education.

Nor do we shrink from a discussion of the treatment accorded to Protestant scholars in Catholic schools. It is a question which ought to be raised and settled, and materials for answering it are at hand. So far back as 1849, it appeared to Mr. Marshall right to inquire what was the position of Protestants in Catholic schools, and how far they were subject to the special influences and instructions which their companions are not permitted to decline. The universal rule he reports to be, that "in no case do they receive religious instruction without the express sanction or request of their parents, and that either they are at liberty to absent themselves from the school altogether when it is communicated, or else the Catholic children are withdrawn to some convenient place, commonly to the church or chapel, in order to be instructed apart. The first susceptibility of religious professions," he adds, "is thus duly consulted and respected, and they who demand liberty of conscience as their own most cherished right are careful to avoid the criminal inconsistency of violating that sacred privilege in their dealings with others." During his examination before the Commissioners in December 1859, Mr. Marshall does not speak so positively upon the point. In answer to a remark of Sir J. Coleridge, that the Protestant children in Roman Catholic schools of course get the same religious instruction as the Roman Catholic children do, he replies: "That is a point to which I have paid a great deal of attention, and there is no rule. There are many of our schools where the parents are told, 'We will teach your child, if you like, but it will be

taught exactly the same as any other children.' In some cases that is not insisted on, and I have known more than one case of pupil-teachers in our schools who entered them Protestants, and quitted them Protestants; but those are exceptions." And when further asked if the Roman Catholic Church, by her authorities, lays down any stringent rule that it is necessary for children receiving the secular education at a Roman Catholic school to receive the religious education also, he answers: "No; it leaves a discretion to the local managers, who either impose the religious instruction or not, as they think fit." At the close of his evidence, the Commissioners suppose the Privy Council to put a condition on aid to Catholic schools, and to say, "Unless you will consent to receive Protestant children, and allow them to be absent from religious instruction, we will not afford you any help;" and they ask what effect such a rule would have. With great decision, Mr. Marshall testifies that "the effect of it would be, that we should not accept it; we would never accept the Irish system; the effect of the introduction of any such principle with us would be to withdraw every Catholic school from public aid, absolutely and finally." Such, very possibly, was the private opinion and anticipation of the witness; but, however well-informed and qualified from long experience to speak of the condition of inspected schools, Mr. Marshall certainly had no authority to promulgate an ecclesiastical decision, still less to upset and reverse a decision deliberately made and solemnly communicated to the State by the English Bishops. For the regulation hypothetically suggested by the Commissioners was in fact a condition precedent to the admission of Catholic schools to public aid, and to the appointment of a Catholic inspector. Ample documentary evidence exists to prove that the question of the admission and treatment of Protestant children in Roman Catholic schools was at the earliest moment mooted by the Government, considered by the Catholic representatives, and authoritatively arranged between the high contracting parties. It was in February 1847 when the Catholic Institute, the immediate precursor of the Poor-School Committee, made the first formal application for aid towards the erection of Catholic schools, that Lord Lansdowne, then President of the Council, directed the Secretary of the Education Department to inquire whether it was proposed that the schools intended to be erected for the instruction of Roman Catholic children should be open to children of Protestant parents. If the school was intended to be exclusively for children of Roman Catholic descent, his

lordship desired to be informed by what regulations poor children of Protestant parents were to be excluded. If the school was to be opened indiscriminately to all children who might seek admission, whether of Roman Catholic or Protestant descent, his lordship desired to be informed whether the religious and the secular instruction of the scholars were to be given at the same or at different hours. In either case, his lordship wished to know whether it was proposed to adopt any, and, if so, what, practical arrangements by which none but children of Roman Catholic parents would be permitted to be present during religious instruction in the proposed schools. These searching inquiries were too grave for an off-hand reply. They were submitted to the Vicars-Apostolic, and discussed at the next Easter meeting. Upon the 14th April following, Bishop Walsh wrote to Mr. Langdale, from Golden Square, in these terms :

“The Bishops assembled instruct me to thank you for a copy of the letter of W. Kay Shuttleworth, Esq., to you, of the 18th Feb. They have given their best consideration to its important contents. They beg respectfully to state that, on receiving a grant from Government for our charity schools, it is not intended to make them exclusive, so as to prevent the admission of children of Protestant parents or guardians. In case the children of Protestant parents should resort to our schools, they will not be required to remain in the school at the time of religious instruction being given, unless their parents or guardians have previously expressed their consent and approbation.”

Nothing could be plainer or more decided. Protestant children were to be admitted, and were not to receive religious instruction without the consent of their parents. Such is the Bishop's pledge in 1847. It may, of course, be argued that a casual meeting of Bishops in London has no synodical authority, and that the decisions of such meetings do not bind ; and, moreover, that, had the Bishops seriously proposed to carry the undertaking into practice, each of them would have promulgated disciplinary regulations for his own diocese ; or, again, that the new hierarchy is under no obligation to observe the joint resolutions of former Vicars-Apostolic. Some visionary might even be found to plead that the promise of the Bishops was *ultra vires*, contrary to the Divine law, and essentially void and without effect. Canonists may settle such questions ; but surely, as between man and man, upon any maxims which render society possible, by every rule of integrity, Catholics are obliged either honourably to fulfil Bishop Walsh's pledge, or openly, and through an official medium, to repudiate it.

But perhaps it may be imagined that the resolution of the assembled Bishops was never communicated to the Government. Far otherwise. In conformity with the understanding come to, Colonel Keppel, upon 25th May 1847, writing on behalf of Lord J. Russell, proposed to the Catholic Institute a basis for minutes designed to extend public assistance to Roman Catholic schools, and among the terms was the following: "Children whose parents conscientiously object to the religious instruction to be permitted to partake of the secular instruction without attending at the hours of religious instruction." The Catholic Institute again consulted the Vicars-Apostolic, and at last, upon 25th June, with due deliberation, they presented to the Premier a formal and very lengthy document, in which, after premising that "the admission of other than Roman Catholic children for the purposes of instruction into Roman Catholic schools is considered secondary to the accommodation in the first place of Roman Catholic children," and after a distinct and very becoming declaration, that "religion is the pervading principle of all instruction given to children in Roman Catholic schools," they conclude that, "if Lord J. Russell intends to refer by the term 'religious' to what the Committee feel persuaded his lordship must allude to, namely, to catechetical instruction on the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, they have no difficulty in not only sanctioning, but insisting on a principle so much in accordance with the dictates of their holy religion, that children whose parents conscientiously object thereto should not be required to attend during the time of such catechetical instruction." There can therefore be no doubt of the preliminary condition under which Catholic schools were admitted to share in Government grants, and as little about the considerable sums which they have now derived from that source; and we are deeply concerned to find Mr. Marshall reporting of the Yorkshire schools, where two-thirds of the children are Protestants, and where Government grants amount to nearly 2000*l.*, that "all the children learn the same catechism, and practise the same devotions, and lead, in short, the same religious life." Let us hope that all their parents and guardians have previously expressed their consent and approbation of the religious life and the catechetical instruction.

The last phrase will introduce an extract from one of the metropolitan Assistants, with which for the present we must close our incomplete notice of the Royal Commission and its consequences.

"I took down the following passages from the address of the

priest at one of the few Roman Catholic Sunday-schools I visited. I quote it, of course, without reference to any doctrinal differences, but simply as a specimen of what an educated and able man (for I can speak favourably not only of his reputation, but of the state of his school) thought adapted to the intelligence of children, the oldest of whom was not seventeen.

‘Plato, commenting on Socrates, thought he would go to heaven because he was so clever, and saw through the errors of the pagan system; but St. Augustine, who, you know, my children, is one of the revered Fathers of our Church, had great doubts whether he could be saved, because he did not believe in Jesus Christ. . . .

‘Suffer death; yes, at the cross, rather than commit mortal sin. You may be nearer carrying the principle into practice than you believe. There is a strong opinion, which has gained ground among pious and reflecting people, that shortly before the close of the world, some think in three years, there will come a terrible time of persecution. Antichrist will be permitted to be triumphant for a time, and you may be called upon to testify, as the saints of old, with your lives.’”

THE LIFE OF DR. DOYLE.*

(Second Notice.)

THE second volume of Mr. Fitz-Patrick's Biography of Dr. Doyle records the last seven years of a life which constitutes a chapter in the annals of Ireland. In many respects this is the most interesting part of his careful and valuable work. The great struggle for Emancipation was over, it is true, at an early period in those last seven years; but other questions possessing not less of an inward significance, and more immediately spiritual in their bearings, arose in its place. Some of these questions—that of education, for instance, and those connected with the proselytising movement—were new only so far as circumstances had modified them. They had been assuming more and more of importance ever since the relaxation of the penal laws. In proportion as men become possessed of political privileges, and of that freedom which is even more a trust than it is a privilege, they require imperatively a corresponding advance in their intellectual and moral culture to fit them for their new duties. In proportion as those chains were broken to which an earlier period of tyranny had looked for the suppression of the Catholic

* The Life, Times, and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. By William John Fitz-Patrick. James Duffy, Dublin and London.

Church in Ireland, the zealots of a later day endeavoured to effect by polemical efforts, and an indirect coercion, what the coarser instruments devised by political animosity had broken in trying to effect. Innumerable efforts were made, sometimes by very sincere and charitable persons, sometimes by bigots, in whom sectarian animosities were sharpened by that prescient instinct which forbodes a coming doom,—efforts to change the faith of the people, or rather to substitute for that faith the changeful and ill-digested theological opinions of an established Sect. Such efforts were often met by anger, and often by scorn : they were not wholly unattended by success, though of a very trivial and transitory character ; but Dr. Doyle at once perceived how they were to be rendered harmless, nay, turned into a lasting advantage.

The time, he perceived, had come when the organisation which the Church alone can supply, and a true Catholic enlightenment, were to preoccupy that ground which an officious zeal and a false enlightenment aspired to take possession of. He looked to a deep and wide Catholic education as the great work of the age. Every period, he knew, has its own dangers and exemptions, its own diseases and medicines. Persecution had in its fiercer day assailed the Catholics of Ireland as a body, and as a body they had banded themselves passively against the oppressor, waiting God's time. That oppressor was, in many cases, far from desiring either to convert or to educate a subject race, which he regarded as helpless in proportion as it was degraded, and which, if elevated, would probably expect, like the English farmer or labourer, a larger proportion of the fruits of the soil—perhaps even a share in the government of his country. The new trial was of an opposite character. A poor and weak peasantry were called on to discuss logical and theological questions with controversialists in whose hands were the weapons of the strong, and who, if not well informed, had at least monopolised that provision set apart in ancient times for the instruction and consolation of a people. It is proverbially not easy, even for a philosopher, to “argue with the master of forty legions.” The peasant was here withdrawn from the collective body and assailed individually ; and his defence could only be effectually found in the clearness as well as the strength of his individual convictions, even when deprived of such support as the convictions of the poor commonly derive from social traditions and from national sympathies. Dr. Doyle also, foreseeing that an end was assuredly approaching, not only to the thralldom of his country, but likewise to those circumstances which had long kept her in unex-

amplified poverty, foresaw no less clearly that prosperity, whenever it came, would bring with it temptations unknown to adversity. It is less hard to despise the world when it affronts us than when its allurements are laid at our feet. It is comparatively easy to realise things unseen when the sphere of sense does not assume for us its more brilliant array. The cloak which the storm could not blow away is flung aside, as the fable teaches, when the sun beats on us. If the poor themselves may be endangered by such prosperity as is theirs at times, if the prayer for daily and heavenly bread may lose somewhat of its fervour on the lips of men in humble life whose granaries are well stored, how much greater must the temptation prove to the class immediately above them! How easy for a man, if not strong-minded or deep-hearted, to become, for the first time, ashamed of his religion, and disposed to contract for himself a separate peace, when the restoration of that wealth and social position of which he has long been unjustly deprived brings him into unwonted contact with persons his superiors in education and self-confidence, though possibly his inferiors in antiquity of race, as well as in all that relates to religion! Dr. Doyle, as the battle advanced to the victory, never even in the heat of conflict forgot the new and more urgent needs which victory itself must call forth. As he built with the sword in one hand, so he fought without relaxing his grasp of the Book, and he pressed the Crucifix ever closer to his heart as the event became less doubtful. In education he provided for such dangers as assailed his flock through the intellect; in the ancient conventual institutions which he defended, and those of later date which he introduced into his diocese, he provided those spiritual weapons, "tempered in the armoury of God," the keen edge of which cannot be blunted by the resistance of the most materialistic or the most Epicurean age; in his new cathedral, the stately walls of which astonished those who had worshiped in huts, as their fathers had worshiped in caves, he compelled the things that are visible to render homage to Him who is a Spirit, and thus strengthened men through the imagination itself against the weakness into which they are betrayed by a dazzled or a corrupted imagination; and while thus peacefully militant, he carried that other war which he had not provoked into the aggressor's camp, and replied to tracts intended to puzzle peasants by pamphlets, each of which descended like a shell amid the circle of astonished theologians.

It is thus that a man who is truly great, while doing the work of the day, rises unconsciously above the needs of

his own day alone. He belongs to all time, and the future is a part of his inheritance. But for such men the just cause would sometimes lose more by the sudden removal of oppression than it had previously suffered from the oppression itself. Its representatives would be found unfit for their new position and their new duties, and consequently their new privileges would but become a snare to them. On the other hand, there would undoubtedly rise up men, at the opposite side, who had inherited, not created, an unjust order of things, and who for that reason had not become wholly vitiated by it. Deprived of their former enervating props, the more wary, if not the wiser, for experience, and braver, if not humbler, for adversity,—such men would resolutely do the best for a bad cause. Mr. Landor, in one of his most striking “Imaginary Conversations,” puts the following words into the mouth of Cicero while commenting, in the sadness of vain retrospect, on the war between Cæsar and Pompey and the downfall of the republic: “The Gods, as if the more to perplex us, had placed the best men upon the worst side.” This is far from being always the case when the best side is yet the side that loses; but something like this has sometimes chanced when the best side, though it has emerged from calamity, fails to carry out its victory. The slowness with which, in such a case, the just cause reaches its full exterior consummation may in such cases be providentially designed in order that its political progress may not too far outrun the intellectual, or the intellectual the spiritual. In these things a proportion must ever be kept. In a youth, if the bodily growth, without being in itself excessive, were yet to outrun the mental, the result would be one full of danger. Something of this sort is true of a nation. To them also the adage, “more haste, less speed,” sometimes applies. It was a proof alike of Dr. Doyle’s wisdom and patriotism, that he so clearly discerned the conditions under which alone his country could rapidly reap the fruit of her long vigils and matchless endurance. He neither railed at his adversaries nor despised them. He did them full, nay generous, justice, if the expression may be admitted; but he encountered and overthrew them. They learned from him that moderation is not weakness, and that dignity is not apathy.

Mr. Fitz-Patrick gives us a very amusing account* of the excitement produced in 1827 by the movement which was announced as the “second Reformation of Ireland,” an account all the more trustworthy for the ample

* Vol. ii. p. 2.

allowance which, like Dr. Doyle, he makes for the credulous supporters of the enterprise :

“ ‘ Weekly bulletins of the number of new converts from Popery,’ writes Mr. O Neill Daunt, ‘ were placarded on the walls, and suspended round the necks of persons hired to perambulate the public streets. Fourteen hundred and eighty-three converts were at one period announced as the fruit of Lord Farnham’s exertions in Cavan ; but when Archbishop Magee went down to confirm them, their numbers had shrunk to forty-two. He kept open house for proselytes, who were furnished with soup, potatoes, and, in some instances, with clothes.’ ”

Dr. Doyle, in whose diocese, that very year, 248 conversions to *Catholicism* really took place, wrote a pamphlet on this occasion, addressed to Lord Farnham, in which he

“ dealt severely with the Irish temporal establishment ; but his views were hardly stronger than those which had been already expressed by Lords Brougham, Macaulay, John Russell, and the Rev. Sydney Smith.”

To this list Mr. Fitz-Patrick might have added many more names, such as those of Earl Grey and Dr. Arnold. To Lord Farnham’s apprehensions of danger from the concession of the Catholic claims, Dr. Doyle replied by asking him whether he saw no danger from their rejection. On this subject Mr Fitz-Patrick gives us some very remarkable information, not generally accessible, but with which the Duke of Wellington is said to have become acquainted, respecting a

“ force of 40,000 men, which, headed by General Montgomery, the son of an Irish refugee in America, was intended for the invasion of Ireland, had Emancipation continued to be withheld.”*

To all such enterprises, as to all Ribbon conspiracies, Dr. Doyle was ever the most determined opponent. Loyalty was with him an essential part of Catholicism ; but with him loyalty did not mean servility to disloyal laws, still less to Governments of the day which, at the same time perhaps, express sympathy with rebellion abroad and maintain oppression at home. He concludes,

“ I would say, my lord, to you,—every Catholic should say it to every Protestant—every liberator should say it to every Orangeman—every priest to every parson,—‘ *Jungamus dexterarum*,’ let us unite our hands, let us rally round the throne, and, inviting our sovereign to govern us by just and equal laws, enable him to exclaim, in defiance before the face of all the world, the words of Christian fortitude engraved on his crest, *Dieu et mon droit !*”†

* Vol. ii. p. 5.

† p. 6.

Soon afterwards Dr. Doyle published another pamphlet of 146 pages, in reply to a pastoral charge by Archbishop Magee. In place of referring further to it, we must hasten on and present our readers with some illustrations of the Bishop's zeal in favour of education. In February 1827, he took a large part in the establishment of the "Catholic Book Society of Dublin;" a society instituted for the publication and the diffusion of moral and religious books suited especially to the exigencies of the day. Dr. Doyle was the first prelate, after the Archbishop of Dublin, to give his efficient support to this society (one which would be quite as useful in our day as it proved in his), and wrote an address on its objects and advantages.* On the 24th of November in the same year, he put forward one of his favourite plans, that for the formation of a model school, in which science should be made to promote the spiritual interests of the Catholic faith, by making her sons more fit for the battle of life, as in the Middle Ages she had furthered those interests by rendering the Aristotelian logic the organ of Christian theology, and as the railway of a later day is destined to discover its nobler vocation in the aid which it furnishes to the Mission of the Cross.

"The instruction he proposed to impart was to comprise the theory and practice of design, abridgments of natural history, elements of mathematics, including algebra, proportion, something of logarithms, geometry, and some plane and spherical trigonometry, even a little of conic sections, and a tincture of chemistry. What is greatly wanted is a supply of masters well instructed in the elements of science, above all, in mathematics, who would develop and form the immense mass of talent always to be found among the middling class of society in Ireland. There is no benefit which the Catholic Association could confer upon the country comparable to the establishment, on a broad basis, of a model school. If this were attempted, and the attempt made with sobriety, discretion, and zeal, I have no doubt but it would receive aid from men of all parties, who, differing on many things, are agreed in their love of Ireland. It would be the means of preparing for generations yet to come more individual wealth, knowledge, happiness, power, and fame, than any other measure which could be undertaken with equal ease in Ireland."†

In the year 1829 Dr. Doyle resumed this momentous subject in a letter to O'Connell.

"If it can be accomplished, a greater good will, in my opinion, be prepared for Ireland than is likely to result from any of the numerous projects undertaken of late years for her advantage. A bold peasantry, it is true, is a nation's strength; but an educated people

* Vol. ii. p. 2.

† p. 44.

will be free and bold and opulent. The country possessed by such a people will have within her a fund of virtue, of invention, of energy, and power, which can never be exhausted. Hence we find that all those great men who created empires, organised governments, framed useful laws, and, as it were, founded on a firm basis public morality and Divine worship, considered the establishment of literary institutions as the glory of their age, and the most lasting advantage conferred by them upon their people. . . . Dr. Doyle complained that Ireland, with eight millions of inhabitants, possessed but one university, and that four at least would be required. The religious tests and exclusions of the existing university were, he submitted, a libel upon its very name ; for a university, to be such, should not confine its advantages to any particular class. She should not, whatever her system of instruction might be, devote herself almost exclusively, as ours had done, to preparing a limited number of gentlemen for the learned professions, or close practically her doors against the middling classes of the people.”*

So long ago as the year 1768 various persons of influence and patriotism united in an attempt to found a scientific institute serviceable to Ireland. Strangely enough, their counsellor on this occasion was a Catholic and a Jesuit. His name was Joseph Fenn. He was a man of eminent mathematical and philosophical acquirements ; but he was persecuted till he became deranged ; his days were ended in a madhouse, and his name is all but forgotten in the land he laboured to serve. The institution which he helped to found (the Dublin Society) survives. Its benefits were not, however, so widely diffused as to satisfy conceptions like those cherished by Dr. Doyle. His aspirations were,

“To work the immense mine of human talent which lies buried in Ireland, to separate the fine ore from the baser metals which encompass it, to bring it forth, and enrich by its aid, not only this country, but every country on the habitable globe. Our ancestors once peopled Scotland ; they afterwards civilised and taught it to believe in one only true God. These Scots became a people equally signalised for their virtues and their crimes ; but since education, in these latter ages, subdued their fiercer passions, they cultivated literature, so that ‘their staple commodity was said to be learning, and their chief export to be learned men.’ Thus trade enriched them ; their bravery and determination had already made them free. Let us learn from these our descendants, not how to change the barren moor into a meadow, or to fertilise the mountain,—for nature has exempted us from this unwholesome toil,—but to cultivate our talents, to educate our people, to acquire and secure our freedom, and to possess in peace and security the abundance with which our country teems ;—let it be our object, not to export learning for gain,

or send forth the needy scholar to forage India or the Cape for gold, but let us call forth, from wheresoever he may be found, the apostle to carry the light of religion to him who is in darkness, the philosopher to guide the councils of nations, the men of letters to occupy the seats of learning, as we did formerly throughout Europe.”*

With this splendid prospect he thus contrasts the condition of a country which does not know what she may be because she forgets what she has been :

“ Let us take a single captive, and view him in this prison of of the soul, incapable almost of counting, by notches, the days of his captivity. Let us view him seated amidst the ruins of one of his ancient cities, on the site of some decayed temple, amazed at the grandeur of its mouldering arches, but ignorant perhaps that the very soil existed a century before. Let him only be made acquainted with the history of his country ; let her heroes, her saints, and her sages pass in review before his enraptured imagination ; let the chiding spirit of one of her great orators point out to him the mighty wreck of his country,—and the gloomy melancholy will confer more real pleasure than the sceptre of a monarch could bestow : but the effects will not stop here ; he will be aroused from his lethargy ; he will vindicate his own rights and those of his country, or enrich her with the products of his labour or his art.”†

It is thus that the records of old times have ministered to the greatness of other countries,—to that of England and of Scotland no less than to that of Greece and of Italy. If there be statesmen who imagine that from the education of that country alone for which Dr. Doyle struggled the annals of the past should be excluded, let them seriously ask themselves whether, considering that the histories of all nations abound with instances of wrong which have long since been forgiven, and which now excite no jealousy, it may not be something in the present, more than in the past, of Ireland which makes a true knowledge of her history more disquieting to her rulers than the appeals of the loudest demagogue. If this be the case, the remedy will be found in equal laws, ecclesiastical as well as civil, not in a vain endeavour to keep the secret which every one knows, and to create that monster in the political world—a nation as much without recollections as though it were a colony.

We have seen how wholly free were Dr. Doyle’s opinions on education from narrowness, and from that which is often denounced as priestcraft by men who are slow to observe that there is also such a thing as statecraft in the world. Like the greatest Catholic theologians, he feared not science, but ignorance ; and with reference to the secular part of instruction,

* Vol. ii. p. 143.

+ p. 144.

his language was as liberal and unexacting as that used in recent times by the hierarchy of his country in those parts of their pastorals which do not treat of religious instruction, and which the newspapers have not always found it convenient to quote. Did he think, therefore, that secular instruction was ever, in a single case, to be disconnected from religious, or that the latter, which alone elevates instruction into education, and but for which the former would prove destructive alike to the State and to the people, should be allowed, if any, at least a subordinate place? It is thus that he speaks on this subject in an address to his flock :

“In all these schools religion shall be the first and the last occupation of the child—to raise his pure hands to Heaven ; as it is the first duty assigned him by his Creator, so shall it be the groundwork of all the instruction he may receive. Religion shall not be banished, like some dangerous infection, from our schools. The child shall not be taught to hide the summary of the law of God, to commune with Heaven by stealth, to deceive some petulant inspector, and shield his piety by a lie. No ; in our schools religious instruction shall be the basis of education ; and this religious instruction will embrace whatever can contribute to mould the heart to virtue, to subdue the passions, to regulate the affections, and prepare the mind of the child for that world full of danger into which, on leaving school, he is obliged to enter.”*

Dr. Doyle's opinions have been represented, doubtless without any intention to colour them unduly, as of a character very different from that which will be attributed to them by a careful reader of these volumes. Dr. Doyle was a man of moderation, and for that very reason would have shunned the Erastian extreme, as well as any other extreme, on such subjects. The great importance of the subject will serve as a sufficient excuse for our dwelling upon it a little longer

It is painful to think how near his aspirations were to fulfilment, and yet how certainly, if we assign due weight to those principles which he so often insisted on, and never disavowed, they remain unfulfilled. Dr. Doyle desired a model school for the training of masters, and he was dissatisfied with the University of Dublin. Ireland now possesses model schools in abundance, and three provincial colleges. Neither money nor care has been stinted : why has not the result been peace? Because Dr. Doyle's principles are no longer carried out, as at first, in the National schools (where, in the case of non-vested schools under Protestant patrons and masters, there remains no guarantee that the Catholic

child shall receive Catholic instruction), and because in the provincial colleges his principles were never carried out. What would Dr. Doyle, who insisted on such careful spiritual provision for children, who, except when at school, must have been always under the religious influences of home and neighbourhood, have thought of colleges, under the control of Government, in which, at a far more perilous age, and in the immediate prospect of far greater temptations than those which beset the path of peasants, young men are invited to receive lectures on history and philosophy delivered, possibly, by professors of a religion opposed to their own? What would he have thought of the disruption of family ties, without any provision for such a moral discipline in their place as was provided by the collegiate institutes of old times? If pressed by the scientific claims of the Queen's Colleges, would he not have replied, "This ye should have done, and not left the other undone"? Would he not have asked, "Is it more necessary that model schools should be established without effectual religious control in Ireland, where there are but three important religious denominations, than in England, where the sects are so numerous? Does this diversity recommend itself especially to those persons who insist so strongly upon uniformity of law between the two islands, on matters relating to the tenure of land, when replying to demands grounded expressly on those circumstances notoriously peculiar to the Irish farmer? Is it absolutely necessary that in Ireland a Protestant parent, dissatisfied with the ecclesiastical provisions of the Queen's Colleges, should be able to send his son to the University of Dublin, where he will attend chapel, and enjoy a religious education, and where the highest and governing offices, magnificently maintained out of the spoils of the Catholic Church, are thrown open as objects of his ambition; and yet, that a Catholic parent, dissatisfied with the Queen's Colleges on the same grounds, shall be only able to send his son to the Dublin University in a position of inferiority, and without his there receiving any religious education?"

Sir Thomas Wyse was, in Dr. Doyle's day, the greatest Irish authority on education after that prelate. He too is frequently claimed by the partisans of the present order of things. But his views, as set forth in his celebrated speech at Waterford, subsequently published as a pamphlet, are essentially different from those which Parliament has yet carried out. He recommends, it is true, provincial colleges, and also county academies; but the crown of his educational scheme has no counterpart in that which has been actually estab-

lished. It was a great University system, in which Catholics and Protestants were to stand on an exactly equal footing. According to him, either the Dublin University was to be thrown open to Catholics on terms of entire equality, as regards fellowships, &c., or else a special Catholic university was to be *founded, endowed, and chartered* for them by the State,—a university to be governed by a Catholic board, and the religious education of which was to be Catholic. Maynooth may be said to correspond with the *theological faculty* of the Dublin University. Sir Thomas Wyse insisted that the Catholic laity should stand upon an equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, not only, as they now do, in his suggested provincial colleges, but likewise in the university system of Ireland. Has his advice been adopted? Alas, we know that the Catholics have at their own expense founded a Catholic university, and that successive governments have refused it even a charter! The exclusive partisans of what, by some, is called “comprehensiveness in education,” and, by others, “promiscuousness and confusion,” will not permit a “clear stage,” even in conjunction with “no favour,” to men whose sole offence is, that they hold principles exactly similar to those professed on collegiate education by the immense majority of their Protestant fellow-subjects, both in England and Ireland! Free trade and frank competition are good things, except where Catholic students claim the benefit of them. In that case alone, the competitors at one side are to be furnished with all the aid the law or the administration can lend them, and their rivals at the other side are to dance in chains. Those who are stigmatised as “exclusive” would be perfectly contented if the Irish people were but allowed to choose for themselves between two systems offered to them on equal terms. They never will be contented with inequality. But let not those enthusiasts of a theory who see danger where none exists, and who see none in thus keeping open wounds of old time,—let them not fight their battle under the shield of Dr. Doyle. A very different class of persons, who had denounced that great prelate all his life on theological grounds, claimed him, when dead, as a convert to Protestantism.*

* The following extract from a letter written by Archbishop Murray throws an interesting light upon the opinions entertained by him, and by two eminent statesmen, Lord Brougham and Lord Melbourne, on the subject of education: “*Entre nous*, Mr. Brougham has been consulted by Mr. Lamb on the education question, and gave it as his opinion, that the more practicable way of educating Catholics and Protestants would be to educate them separately. This I learned in a communication which I had lately with Mr. Lamb

Dr. Doyle, both from character and from his political habits of thought and life, was wisely desirous to conciliate, so far as conciliation involved no surrender of principle. He singularly united the “*suaviter in modo*” with the “*fortiter in re*”; a gift restricted to those who possess, not only disinterestedness and sobriety of judgment, but also that keen eye which instinctively discriminates between what is essential and what is accidental. But unworthy compromise and ill-timed conciliation were foreign to his nature. It is thus that he wrote to Mr. George Ensor in 1828 :

“You allude to my not being at the Castle festivities. It is a glorious pastime for Irishmen, when their country is *in extremis*, to sport with the satrap of England, to jostle among gentry with swords and bags on a collar-day ; and how honoured to have the privilege of the *entrée*—that is, to be smuggled as masquers by a back-door into the satrap’s presence ! As to Protestants being so captivated I do not wonder ; but that the Catholic Irish can swallow hook, line, and rod, exhibits their deglutition as equal to the far-famed craters ! These things almost make me despair. I used to pray for Ireland, but I have given that up ; for however I might begin, I end with curses, the baseness of man turning me for the instant from the goodness of God. *I have been stung by what you say of your unsuccessful efforts respecting education.*”*

The last sentence is suggestive. It seems to imply that, even before the Irish hierarchy had been proscribed by the Ecclesiastical Titles’ Bill, there were subjects by which one of the most large-minded and temperate of the Irish Bishops—one especially a preacher of loyalty—could be moved beyond his wont. We must not quit the subject of education without alluding to the extraordinary care and complete success with which he conducted his own college of Carlow. Mr. Fitz-Patrick tells us :

“Dr. Doyle was fond of contemplating Bishops in embryo. He is known to have specially trained several ecclesiastics at Carlow with a view to the episcopate. Among others may be mentioned the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, Right Rev. Dr. Nolan, the late Right

on the subject. I told him that though we did not object to the joint education, *we would certainly prefer Mr. Brougham’s plan*. I fear, however, that we shall not obtain *so much as that*. He, however, admitted the principle, that the whole of the religious instruction of the children should be placed under the control of their *respective pastors*” (vol. ii. p. 93). These statesmen could not have been surprised at the celebrated Papal Rescript which stated that the National system of 1831 was rather to be accepted than approved in principle, and that in accepting it the utmost limits of justifiable concession on the part of Catholics was reached. The substitution of an imaginary parental authority for a real pastoral one, and the other later changes in the system of 1831, could never have been sanctioned by principles such as they then held.

* Vol. ii. p. 65.

Rev. Dr. Clancy, and the Right Rev. Dr. Walshe. . . . Most of the priests who studied at Carlow during Dr. Doyle's time have attained not a little distinction. Bishop O'Connor informs us that in his presence Dr. Doyle referred to the moral and intellectual gifts of the Rev. Paul Cullen, and prophesied that at a future day he would rise to deserved eminence.*

We can but briefly indicate in passing many topics upon which the reader of these volumes will pause. Such are the philosophical discussion in which Dr. Doyle controverted Locke's theory respecting innate ideas;† the celebrated national petition for Catholic Emancipation, simultaneously signed in every parish in Ireland on Sunday, the 13th of January 1827, when, by upwards of five millions of people, "aspirations were, at the same hour after the Holy Sacrifice, offered up for liberty of conscience;"‡ the hostile proceedings against the Irish Regulars secretly but unsuccessfully carried on, apparently by more than one government, in the earlier part of this century;§ Dr. Doyle's letter to the Duke of Wellington, in June 1828, assuring him that, "the Catholic clergy never will partake of any provision of whatsoever description which will render them liable to even a suspicion of being detached from the people;"|| the question of domestic nomination of Bishops, and of an Irish patriarchate;¶ Dr. Doyle's public letter encouraging O'Connell to undertake the enterprise of the Clare election, and the exclamation of the great tribune on reading it :

"If I had spent twenty-eight centuries, instead of twenty-eight years, in the service of my country, the sentiments expressed in that letter would more than amply reward them. . . . The approbation of Dr. Doyle will bring to our cause the united voice of Ireland. I trust it will be the *vox populi, vox Dei*."**

We must, however, find room for an amusing anecdote, illustrating the mode in which those traditional jealousies to which politicians are subject (even when their legislation on ecclesiastical subjects does not belong to the "fast" school) are sometimes accidentally dispelled. The occurrence took place in 1829, when the very statesmen who were giving liberty to the Catholics yet could hardly shake off a vague impression that their religion was an organised conspiracy. It recalls an idea which must frequently have occurred to many among us, viz. that if the private conversation of the most zealous Catholics chanced but to be overheard by their opponents, nothing could tend more to dissipate causeless alarms, and to bring about a kindly mutual understanding.

* Vol. ii. p. 146.

† p. 39.

‡ p. 51.

§ p. 57.

|| p. 72.

¶ p. 73.

** p. 77.

"The late Mr. Eneas Mac Donnell was in London at this period, in his capacity of agent to the Catholics of Ireland. He had been in almost daily correspondence with all the Catholic prelates with the exception of Dr. Doyle. Mr. Mac Donnell was sauntering through Spring Gardens with a dozen episcopal letters, which he had just received, in his hand, when he met George Robert Dawson, M.P. for Derry, bustling along to keep a sharp appointment with the Duke of Wellington. Mr. Dawson noticed the pile of letters, and jocosely asked the agent if he would allow him to bring them to the Horse Guards, where the Duke, Mr. Peel, and Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst, were at that moment sitting in solemn conclave. Mr. Mac Donnell promptly acquiesced. 'You do not mean to say,' proceeded Mr. Dawson, 'that I am at liberty to place before the Cabinet your confidential correspondence with the Roman Catholic Bishops?' 'I am perfectly serious,' replied the agent; 'the only stipulation I make is, that you return them to me before noon to-morrow.' George Dawson was punctual next day with the letters. 'You have no conception,' he said, 'of what good these documents have been productive. The Duke was greatly pleased with them. The dates proved that the prelates wrote their respective views without consultation amongst themselves.'"

To illustrate Dr. Doyle's life adequately is beyond our present limits; we must content ourselves with bringing together some of those traits by which Mr. Fitz-Patrick has illustrated his character. Dr. Doyle reconciled in himself qualities to harmonise which required the peculiar circumstances of time and country under which he lived. He was the characteristic Bishop of Ireland in the earlier part of the 19th century. No continental country could have produced him. He united the pontiff, the statesman, and the patriot. Like Bossuet's, his mind had eminently a political character; but, as the circumstances of his day made the sympathies of the French prelate gravitate towards the despotic monarchy of Louis XIV., so those of Dr. Doyle's time made him chiefly the vindicator of popular rights. But he was not a one-sided man. In ecclesiastical matters, the 19th century had inherited a far richer experience than the 18th. The experiment of the "Gallican Liberties" had been tried; and their meaning had been proved to be—the liberty of the State to enervate and to subdue a Church which it had isolated. In the political sphere, the experiment of lawless liberty had been tried. It had been found to end in tyranny, as tyranny had ended in anarchy. Dr. Doyle revered the British Constitution (so far as it remained unvitiated by sectarian intolerance) because it shunned both of these extremes, each of which is yet more calamitous in its moral and religious than in its

political results. The surly spirit of democratic independence regards all obedience as, at best, a necessary evil, and all government as but a temporary concordat between a subject race and a ruling class. A paternal despotism, on the other hand, undermines the faculties by denying them a sphere for their exercise, and flings men upon epicurean enjoyments by failing to make room for virtue. But a well-ordered liberty at once develops the powers and disciplines the character; while it strengthens religion by leaving it unshackled, and by not affecting to protect it from those trials which are permitted in order to purify it. Such, as far as we can gather, was the basis of Dr. Doyle's political opinions. They are to be collected from many scattered notices in these volumes, and are often expressed with a singular shrewdness of observation, as well as depth of thought. "I know," he says on one occasion, "that the substance of right is very distinct from the *apices juris*, and that a reference to privilege (a thing odious in its nature) is always calculated to beget opposition. Privilege is like a treasure; it ought to be guarded, but never spoken of." He laughed at that pedantry of religious or political theorists which refuses to make allowances for the necessary diversities of race and character. "My dear friends, the French," he writes in 1830, "always had peculiarities in every thing, and have that sort of religion which suits their nation and the notions prevailing with it. It is so with every nation and people under the sun; and our business is to look on, be instructed and amused, but not influenced by any thing but the unchanged spirit of the Gospel." Mr. Fitz-Patrick accounts for the circumstance of a minister having selected Dr. Doyle as a person with whom to consult on the provisions of the sub-letting Act by the remark:

"Lord Melbourne clearly saw that, besides the peculiar advantages Dr. Doyle possessed for gathering accurate knowledge on the operation of local laws, the style both of his spoken evidence and written arguments was that of a great constitutional lawyer. His frequent references to legal maxims and precedents, and the strength and conciseness of his deductions and conclusions, demonstrated his legal acumen and knowledge."*

The same eminently practical character is illustrated by his correspondence with one whom he describes as "a fine, good-natured, witty, holy nun." He warns her against the visionary piety of the Quietists, and admonishes her to rely only on what is solid and plain. "The outward actions ought to be conformable to the rule prescribed by the law

* Vol. ii. p. 268.

of God, and the inward regulated by the Holy Spirit, obtained by prayer, sacraments, &c.”*

One of Dr. Doyle's characteristics was a courage, moral and physical, which had never allowed him, even for a moment, to know fear, and which made his habitual moderation more remarkable. It will be found curiously illustrated at p. 128 (vol. ii.), in a conversation suggested by the Duke of Wellington's duel with Lord Winchelsea. With this habit was perhaps connected his striking originality.

“He had a peculiar faculty—an attribute which belongs only to men of high genius—of stamping an original character on every theological decision he gave; and such was the freshness and vigour with which he illustrated his propositions, that the hearer never once mistook, and never forgot, an opinion which he advanced. . . . He had the singular gift of imparting a defined and practical character to his teaching, of which the Diocesan Statutes, principally the work of his master mind, give us the highest evidence.”† “‘He would put,’ observes a priest, ‘a succession of the most knotty questions to us, involving a most remarkable retentiveness of memory, with his pen running all the time. He could preserve in his mind the two distinct trains of subtle argument at the same moment.’”‡

His memory, indeed, was so perfect, that he hardly ever forgot any thing he had once read. But the variety of his talents was less remarkable than his unity of mind and purpose. No versatility of intellect ever diverted his heart from the two great objects ever present to them—his faith and his native land which he loved with a devotion that combined the affection of a parent and that of a child. Traveling on the Continent, he writes :

“The Netherlands and the north-west of France, the only portions of that happy country which I saw, appear like a well-cultivated garden, teeming with every luxury which the earth in a genial climate can produce. . . . How often, whilst my heart swelled with feelings not to be described, did I turn to Ireland, and ruminate upon her misfortunes! . . . The earth would lie lightly on our remains, could we secure for those who will tread it some portion of that happiness which other nations enjoy.”§

His charity was inexhaustible. We can but add a few more illustrations of it to those we have already given, in describing his conduct during one of the Irish famines. The Marchioness of Tewkesbury had made Dr. Doyle a present of a carriage. The prelate sold it in order to give its proceeds to the cathedral of Carlow, then in course of erection. A visitor calling about this period at his house, mentioned

* Vol. ii. p. 205.

† p. 203.

‡ p. 307.

§ p. 105.

to him the case of a young lady who wished to become a nun, but who could not do so on account of pecuniary distress, brought on by an unexpected lawsuit. On the departure of his guest, the Bishop placed in his hands a letter. On its being opened, there was found within it a 50*l.* note, with the words, "For the young person for whom you are so interested." Giving evidence on one occasion respecting the lack of lunatic asylums in some parts of Ireland, he incidentally mentioned that for years the residence of a poor idiot belonging to Carlow had been the Bishop's house. A profound and unostentatious piety was the root of this charity. A priest, who well knew him, thus describes him :

"While forced by the circumstances of his time to forego the peaceful retirement of the cloister, the spirit of his religious engagement never forsook him : never did he relinquish his early vows, or the fervour of his first devotion. I well know with what pain he mingled in the distractions of the world. Solitude was his delight to the last ; and prayer and thought filled up whatever short intervals of leisure he enjoyed. Every day he read the Holy Scriptures on his knees, and there, and at the foot of the Cross, he imbibed the lofty zeal that animated all his acts, and the tender unction which flows through his imperishable writings."*

There were occasions on which his piety and his patriotism seemed one. Visiting the Sienna Convent at Drogheda, he was there shown its precious relic, the head of Archbishop Plunket, the last victim to the "Popish Plot," who was tortured to death in 1681, and whose life has recently been so ably written by Dr. Moran. Unable to suppress his emotions, the strong man, who seemed made for battling with adverse polemics, and instructing parliamentary committees, threw himself on his knees to venerate the relic. He felt sure that if Oliver Plunket had not yet been canonised, the great martyr-prelate of the 17th century deserved canonisation.

The political influence which Dr. Doyle acquired without seeking it, and used but on important occasions, indicates the amount of power he might have wielded had he been an ambitious man. Authoritative he probably was, as most men strongly endowed with the governing faculty are ; and, no doubt, a wide sphere for the exercise of his large faculties was agreeable to him ; but from the uneasy egotism of vanity he was wholly free. He put forth his strength only when the shortcomings of others demanded it. He considered that the first Whig ministry after the carrying of Catholic Emancipation treated Ireland with injustice, nay, that in some of their appointments, they were guilty of what sometimes has

* Vol. ii. p. 50.

as lasting effects in the political as in the social world—bad manners. On this subject a singularly interesting correspondence will be found, between him and an English nobleman, whose name is not given, which throws much light on that time. Dr. Doyle's tone is that of a man who has been disappointed in statesmen, to whom he is, notwithstanding, still willing to give a fair trial, but whose reforming tendencies, he thinks, require a considerable stimulus from the expression of Irish public opinion. He refused at this period to pledge himself either in favour of or against Repeal, but urged upon the attention of the Government many measures, of which, before long, they introduced several, though sometimes unsuccessfully, as in the case of the Appropriation Clause.

In the election of 1831, the Orange party was for the first time defeated in Dublin. In the county of Carlow two Liberals were returned to Parliament by Dr. Doyle's influence. It was on this occasion that Mr. Sheil wrote, "Who could have conjectured that a Bachelor of Coimbra, and afterwards a priest in some part of Wexford, and then a Professor of Dogmatic Divinity at the Sacerdotal College of Carlow, should now, with a mitre as lofty as that of Becket (although without a gem in it) on his brow, and a pastoral staff of Bellarmine potency in his hand, legislate for the passions of the people, and not only summon and dismiss at his bidding the popular emotions, but, without a stretch or effort, and by the simple intimation of his will, accomplish that which not a peer in the empire could have effected?" Yet such an exercise of power was with him a wholly disinterested act. Agitation was not his element; and favours, when offered to him, he steadily rejected: as Mr. Fitz-Patrick tells us, he agreed with the Roman emperor who said, "The priest of the gods, if he sometimes visits the palace, should appear there only as the advocate of those who have vainly solicited either justice or mercy. . . . Rank had no charms for him; and that little with which the affection of a grateful flock loves to invest their prelates in moments of salutation, he utterly disliked, and often charged his friends to abstain from using towards him. To be called 'Father' was his utmost ambition." Those who fancy that the celibacy of the clergy must prevent them from sympathising with the domestic relations, will not find their theory confirmed by the following incident. The Bishop was walking with a friend among some wretched hovels in the neighbourhood of Carlow. As some labourers were returning from their work, a number of children, catching sight of them,

rushed out with loud acclamations to meet their parents, who snatched them up in their arms. "Do you not think, my lord," said the Bishop's companion, "that men so poor as these are great fools to marry, and encumber themselves with families?" "Indeed I do not," was the Bishop's reply; "that happiness you would deprive them of is their only comfort. Why should we grudge them to forget for a moment their wretchedness?" In latter times, at least, the frequently-quoted text about "forbidding to marry" would seem oftener applicable to political philosophers than churchmen.

In our desire to bring out the chief traits of Dr. Doyle's character, or the more important lessons to be learned from his career, we have been obliged to leave unnoticed much to which we should have been glad to direct the reader's attention. We must hurry to the close. The decline in Dr. Doyle's health seems to have commenced almost immediately after Catholic Emancipation; and though he fought many a battle after that period, it was with efforts more painful to him as his strength gave way. Doubtless the end might have been deferred, had he obeyed the injunctions of his physicians, and abated his toils; but again and again there was something to be done which no one else could do so well; and the needful journey was postponed, or the needful relaxation brought to an early close. The labours of his diocese were enormous. Among his toils, none tried him more than those so frequently required to keep down Ribbon conspiracies. They were not always successful. On one occasion, propping his failing body with his crosier, as he addressed, on a hill-side, some of those whom his remonstrances and denunciations had hitherto failed to touch, he exclaimed, "Oh, my people! you have broken your Bishop's heart!" On another, he said, "Men of the Queen's County, my blood is upon you." He conducted the retreats of his clergy himself,—first those of the coadjutors, and then those of the parish-priests, preaching on some occasions four times a day, with a power which has been described as awful. He wrote more polemical works, and at least one political treatise on a very grave subject, which has never yet been published, carrying on at the same time a correspondence in Ireland, England, and the Continent, such as alone would have overtasked the energies of most men. But at last he felt that the time of his warfare was drawing to a close. It found him still contemplating new labours.

"‘I spent,’ writes the parish-priest of Ballinakill, ‘some weeks

with Dr. Doyle at Tramore, the autumn previous to his death. He frequently expressed a regret that he had not been spared to accomplish a work which then engaged his mind, and on which he seemed to have set his heart, viz. the elaboration of treatises on laws, justice, and contracts. . . . I remember one day, when sitting on a rock overhanging the sea, his giving me an outline of the manner in which he intended to treat the subject of Law.' ”

As the time for his departure drew nearer, his willingness to take his rest increased. Writing to a nun in May 1834, he said :

“ ‘This is the last time I will attempt to disturb your peace by placing before you that image of coming dissolution which so strongly affects you. . . . The objects for which I seem to have been sent into the world are, in a great degree, attained ; and as the mercy of God is above all His works, and as He hates nothing of what He has made, may we not hope that He is chastising my offences before He calls me to judgment,—a judgment which no man can stand ? ’ ”

He became at last too weak to open his own letters.

“The Vicar-General opened all Dr. Doyle's letters for several weeks before his death. ‘Well, what letters to-day ?’ he would ask. ‘Six, my lord : one from the Secretary of State, soliciting your opinion on his new Bill ; another from Sydney Smith, declaring that the public expression of your opinion on Church property at this crisis would be hailed as a boon by the British Dissenters, as well as the Irish Roman Catholics ; a third from Father —, begging of you to give him faculties ; a fourth from a parson, arguing a point of theology with you ; and two from evangelical ladies, urging you to embrace the truths of Protestantism.’ ”

We can but select a few out of the many touching circumstances with which Mr. Fitz-Patrick has skilfully illustrated the closing scenes of this memorable life.

“About six weeks before the death of Dr. Doyle, a priest visited him ; it was late in the evening, and the sun was just setting in a cloudless May sky. The Bishop was alone, and was very much exhausted. . . . He continually complained of a feeling of suffocation, and he had often been removed from room to room, looking for relief from this overwhelming sensation. On this occasion he was carried to the library window ; and thus situated, he pensively fixed his eyes, as nearly as the position of the house would permit, on the darkening shades of the west. Although he was aware that the priest (an intimate visitor) had entered the room, having heard his name announced by the servant, he still kept his large hazel eyes riveted on the same view, and remained for a considerable time silent and motionless as a statue. Then, awakening as it were from a reverie, and turning round with a sad smile, ‘Alas,’ he said, ‘how indifferent are men to the glorious lessons which our good God every

day, every hour, every minute, places before us in every object that surrounds us ! What signify the ideas of men on paper, or in conversation, in comparison with the facts displayed before us in the wonderful works of nature ! Oh, such power, such wisdom, such order, and such providence ! and, in their silent exhibition, such eloquence, such persuasion ! ”*

His will was a brief one : it consisted but of two lines.

“ ‘ All things that I possess came to me from the Church, and to the Church and the poor let them return, all. ’ The present Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin was by the bedside of Dr. Doyle the whole of the last night. At three o’clock, just as the gray dawn was breaking, Dr. Doyle requested to be carried from his bed, and placed opposite an open window. In this position he slightly revived. The fresh air of morning was laden with fragrance ; the song of the blackbird mingled with the harsher tones of the cornrake. The Bishop’s eyes rested on the rich country, smiling in the luxuriance of June. To the last his mind was as clear and collected as possible. Having detailed to the good priest who supported his knees several directions which he wished to have carried out, Dr. Doyle gave his thoughts entirely up to God, and indulged in a prolonged series of ejaculatory prayers. He made his confession to the late Dr. Nolan. . . . Humble and mortified to the last, he could not endure the utterance of a word that reminded him of any good he had done ; to God alone he gave all the merit ; on God alone were all his ideas fixed. When exhausted nature apprised him that the last sad struggle was approaching, he called for the Viaticum. . . . The Bishop having said, ‘ Take this body of flesh, and fling it on the floor, ’ his attendants gathered up the four corners of the sheet, and placed their burden upon the ground. Dr. Doyle several times endeavoured to raise his long bony arms in order to join his fingers in an attitude of prayer ; but they as often fell from sheer debility. At last the Rev. James Maher presented the Holy Viaticum. ‘ The sublimity and joy of the Bishop’s prayer, ’ says Mr. Maher, ‘ while I repeated the words, *Ecce Agnus Dei*, baffles all description. It seemed to me as if the dying prelate saw a vision of Christ standing meekly and lovingly before him, and that he was fired with an ardour to become instantly dissolved. ’ ”†

Thus died the great Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, on Sunday morning, the 15th of June 1834, in the forty-eighth year of his age, and the fifteenth of his episcopate. During his agony, the Sacrifice of the Mass was offered for him in his private chapel, the cathedral, and the college. For several days afterwards, nearly all the shops in Carlow, Protestant as well as Catholic, remained closed. The cathedral, college, and convent bells tolled throughout the week. On Monday, permission was given to the public to view the

* Vol. ii. p. 493.

† pp. 496, 7.

remains as they lay in state, dressed with the mitre, rochet, cross, and crosier. During two nights, the students of the college kept watch over the body. The Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, with several of their suffragan Bishops, assisted at the solemn obsequies. At the funeral, the people insisted on removing the horses and drawing the hearse themselves; while 20,000 persons attended the procession. Amid the tears and prayers of his people, the lowly Augustinian novice, the ardent student of Coimbra, the pontiff, the patriot, and the statesman, was laid in rest, opposite to the altar of the cathedral he had built. "*Ecce Sacerdos magnus, qui in diebus suis placuit Domino. Non est inventus similis illi, qui conservaret legem Excelsi.*"

Communicated Article.

DR. MANNING ON THE PAPAL SOVEREIGNTY.*

THERE is much food for meditation in Dr. Manning's three lectures. There are cogent proofs of the necessity of affirming some kind of Papal sovereignty; but there are also obscurities of conception and expression which tend to confuse the substance with the accidents of that sovereignty, by raising its external and temporal trappings to the same level as the internal and everlasting truth which lies hid under them.

The lectures begin with a useful distinction:

"The temporal power of the Pope contains in itself two distinct elements. The first is, the sovereignty inherent in his own person; and the second is, the local sovereignty over the State which he holds. These are two distinct things. His own personal sovereignty consists in this: first, that as the Vicar and representative of Jesus Christ, who is King of kings and Lord of lords, he is liberated by Divine right from all civil and temporal subjection to any ruler or prince on earth. Thus he is in himself a personal sovereign, and can be subject to none; and thus also he has, in virtue of his pontificate, a divine authority over all other powers, personal or princely, that can be found among men; forasmuch as when our Divine Lord said to Peter, 'Feed My sheep,' He gave the whole world into his hands; He committed to him not only the direction of individuals one by one, but the direction of families, of households, of all the collective forms of natural society."

* The Last Glories of the Holy See greater than the First. Three Lectures. By H. E. Manning, D.D. Burns and Lambert.

This statement is not sufficiently guarded. The freedom of the Pope by divine right from all civil and temporal subjection must be so interpreted as to save St. Gregory the Great from the imputation of a breach of his trust, when, to use his own words, "he fulfilled his duty in yielding obedience to the emperor, and publishing his order" (forbidding any man fit for service in the wars to enter a monastery), though as Pope he denounced the law as unjust, and warned the Emperor Maurice of the judgment to come. It must be so interpreted as to vindicate the Popes who, for more than a thousand years, all more or less reckoned themselves to owe temporal allegiance to the emperors, whether Greeks, Franks, or Germans, and who, after the empire became Christian, generally sought the confirmation of their election from the emperor. So, again, their sovereignty over all Christians must not only be limited by the meaning of the terms in which it was conveyed,—*"feed My sheep,"* that is, *"feed as pastor,"* not *"govern as Cæsar;"* *"direct in all matters of faith and morals,"* not *"command in all the relations of temporal sovereignty,"*—but it must also be interpreted by the rule, *"render to Cæsar what is Cæsar's,"* and by several declarations of Popes, such as that of St. Gelasius, who says, that whereas in pagan states the spiritual and temporal powers were gathered into one hand, "Christ, in pity to our frailty, tempered the means of our salvation in a glorious dispensation, and separated the spheres of the two powers, giving to each its proper action and its distinct dignity; . . . so that emperors stand in need of Popes for matters of eternal life, and Popes make use of the government of emperors for the course of temporal affairs, so that the sphere of spiritual action might be quite separate from mundane matters, and that the soldier of God should not entangle himself with secular affairs, nor, on the other hand, that the man who was engaged in secular business should make show of presiding over divine matters, so that the modesty of each order might be provided for;"—of Pope Symmachus, who writes to the Emperor Anastasius, that "while the emperor administers human affairs, the Pope dispenses divine things, so that he has, I will not say superior, but equal honour;"—and of Gregory II. to Leo the Isaurian: "As the Pope has no right of inspection in the palace, nor of conferring royal dignities, so neither has the emperor right of inspection in the Church." God and Cæsar can coexist, and so can Pope and Cæsar, each independent in his own sphere, each with his own rights and with his own duties.

But it is also true that all persons and corporations, and

most of their acts, have a double relation ; one to God, and one to the world ; one to eternity, and one to time. The Christian law demands that in its eternal relation every person, every corporation, every human act, should be free of Cæsar, and subject only to God, or to the authorised organ of His revelation and exponent of His will. Further, the Christian law imposes such freedom as a duty on the conscience, and commands us, in the conflict of human and divine law, to obey God only, and to condemn Cæsar. Hence the Church and each of her members has certain rights against all the world : the right to hold and to do that which Christ commands us to hold and to do, and the right to preach, declare, and teach all that the Church is commissioned to preach, declare, and teach. And this in spite of, and notwithstanding all opposition on the part of, the powers of the world.

In one sense, then, every Christian is a personal sovereign, just as the wise man with the Stoics was a king because he had his passions in command, and, whatever happened to his body, his soul was free. For the subjection of the Christian to earthly powers ceases when their laws begin to contradict the laws of God.

Further, the persons who, by God's law, have any responsibility for, or authority over, others, ought to be free from subjection to temporal rulers in proportion to, and within the legitimate limits of, this responsibility or authority. The civil code has no right to interfere between the parent and child within the limits of reasonable obedience. The father possesses not only the personal sovereignty of his own independence and freedom, but the further sovereignty of parental authority over his child. The priest also is personal sovereign in these two senses. For he is not only lord of his own conscience, as against the encroachments of Cæsar, but he is also divinely charged with the care of the consciences of his flock, and therefore must be free to perform this function in the teeth of any mere earthly sovereign. It would be intolerable that the rightful director of consciences, in matters where they are free from the control of Cæsar, should, in giving this direction, be himself subject to Cæsar.

And the sphere of this second element of personal sovereignty, the right of direction, increases as we ascend higher in the pastoral scale. It is greater for the rector of a parish than for the chaplain of a family ; greater for the Bishop than for the rector ; greatest of all for the Pastor of pastors, the successor of St. Peter, who feeds the whole of the flock of Christ.

But, however large in sphere, is the personal sovereignty

of the Pope essentially different from the personal sovereignty of every Christian, of every parent, of every priest? Does it differ in kind, or only in intensity and extensiveness? And if it does not differ in kind, need the guarantees with which it is guarded differ in kind from the guarantees by which the personal sovereignty of every Christian is guarded? As a matter of history and experience, I suppose that at first, in the days of persecution, there was but one guarantee for the confession of the lay Christian, and the "liberty of prophesying" of the priest,—the guarantee of martyrdom. Each was able, and each was bound, to lay down his life for the freedom of belief, the freedom of confession, and the freedom of preaching, in the teeth of a hostile state or a persecuting Cæsar. In those days the personal sovereignty of layman, priest, bishop, or Pope, had but one and the same guarantee. As society went through its historical changes, the guarantees also changed; but they changed equally for all. The personal sovereignty of Bishops, abbots, and priests in the provinces was found to require the same guarantees as the personal sovereignty of the Popes at Rome; all obtained, in their measure and degree, the same immunities and similar temporal possessions and powers, and the Prince-Bishop of Rome was only the chief of a large hierarchy of similar ecclesiastical sovereigns elsewhere. Whatever temporal guarantees Christians found useful to protect their freedom were naturally adopted at Rome, and conversely, whatever the Pope found useful for that purpose was, as far as might be, adopted elsewhere; Christendom thus became a homogeneous organised whole, full of vitality, naturally changing its outward shape as the world changed, and, under St. Gregory VII., utilising the feudal system as easily as it had utilised that of Charlemagne.

But if this is a general law, why is the temporal condition of the Pope now so different from that of Bishops? Are we to conclude that the present state is only one of transition? And if so, whose state is to be altered? Is the temporal condition of the Pope likely to be lowered to that of Bishops, or that of Bishops elevated to the condition which the Pope held a few years ago, and still nominally enjoys? The eye of the politician will not detect many signs of such a restoration of ecclesiastical power in all lands as the latter alternative implies. Is the condition of the Pope, then, to be lowered? The Bishops of Western Europe have almost unanimously declared that it cannot be,—that, "the imperishable vitality and invincible tenacity of the Pope as temporal sovereign will ever be more and more luminously manifested to the world."

But this declaration is not about things which are, but things which are to come. It is not a definition of what is, but an attempt to prophesy what shall be. Now what are such anticipations worth? Was there ever a man to whom it was given, while watching the gradual fall of any great political or religious system, to divine or to guess what was to succeed it? On the approach of great catastrophes, prognostications of destruction and chaos have always been rife; but who ever anticipated what new kosmos was to be fashioned from the chaos, what new edifice was to rise on the ruins of the old? The voice of the prophet was ever a wail over the past and passing, rather than a song of hope for the future. Yet, in spite of anticipations of evil, better orders have for the most part taken the place of those which have vanished, and society on the whole has progressed in morality, civilisation, and individual liberty. After the crash of idolatry, the Christian Church was found seated in the old temples; slavery passed away, and our Christian domestic life took its place; but no philosopher divined the change. Nor have Christians been better seers; though they had the prophecies of Scripture to guide them, yet they knew not how to interpret these predictions; it was not given to them to know the times and seasons which God had kept in His own power. Divine providence has always led the Church into safe and fertile pastures, but not always by the way which her children anticipated. The early Popes dreaded the temporal business and rule which was being forced upon them, and they looked at their new earthly dignities as the instrument, not of their independence, but of their servitude; and therefore, as Mgr. Dupanloup says, "so far from wishing to transform themselves into temporal princes, they deplored bitterly and unceasingly this inevitable transformation; their authority imposed itself upon them against their will." The Popes, then, as popes, have no power of deciphering the future; and though the inquirer will own that it is still the duty of good men to fight for the present order of things, because it is the only order they know of, yet a seeming defeat will never make him despair, for he knows that in the darkness of the future are hidden the germs of an unimagined triumph.

The anticipations of the faithful are no surer guide to a knowledge of the future than to the truths of geology or astronomy. In spite of them, it is not unlikely that the Popes may be once more brought to the same position as other Bishops; for it is unlikely that a system which makes the Papal power unlike every other, which annuls all the steps that once led up to it, all the gradually-widening circles of

similar immunities that once protected it, and which leaves it an anomaly among states, can have the elements of stability. So far as the Pope's personal sovereignty resembles that of other Bishops, of priests, or of Christian laymen, it would probably be best secured by the same means which are found by experience to be the best guarantees of the liberty of the clergy and laity in other lands. Now if we ask where the clergy are least harassed and interfered with in their dealings both with the Pope and their flocks, and under what law and constitution they find the greatest security, we must reply, in England and her colonies, and in the United States, under the laws and constitution of those countries where government does not wish to meddle with our affairs, and where, in spite of some remnants of an old persecuting code, legislators are more or less honestly developing the principle of freedom of religion, by abstaining from all interference, and by leaving the way clear for the legitimate exercise of the personal sovereignty of every Christian. In such countries, doubtless, "a free church in a free state" is theoretically the best guarantee for the personal sovereignty of Pope, Bishop, priest, or layman. But it will not thence follow that it is the best guarantee in Italy, or that Cavour and his disciples are honest in promising it. Indeed, they have discredited their professions by their arbitrary, illegal, and violent method of dealing with the Bishops and clergy, and they have shown that liberty is only meant for those who agree with them, not for those who oppose them. Their deeds have belied their words. A free church in a free state can only replace the temporal sovereignty as the guarantee of Papal independence, when the state can sufficiently secure the freedom of the church both against the administration and against the people. In England, the church is secure enough against the oppression and encroachment of government, but not against a No-popery riot, which might set all rights at defiance in the streets. A free church in a free state, practically, requires English law, and a Catholic population, a combination that may be found in the south of Ireland. It may be true that this theory points in the direction which events are taking; but it does not seem practicable in Italy, governed by Piedmontese administrators under the Cavourian *statuto*. The theory may be perfect, but not fit for these times. Belarmine, like St. Bernard, thought the Pope would be better without temporal power, but he judged it to be necessary *propter malitiam temporum*: he could devise no other means to secure independence; but he did not forget that it was only a means, not an end. In fact, what the Pope wants is,

not a positive right of governing, but a negative right of not being governed; not a centre of political power, but a basis of independence. Hence the extent of this sovereignty is not essential; but it is difficult to see how, even in the most ideally free society, unless the nations were all fused into one great confederation or empire, the Pope could do without some such sovereignty: he will always differ from other Bishops in this, that whereas they belong to particular nations, the Pope belongs to all. Episcopacy is national, the Papacy is international; hence the national securities that are enough for a Bishop may not be enough for a Pope. For instance, how would the free church in a free state secure the freedom of Papal intercourse with the Catholics of a country at war with Italy? But perhaps it is idle to suppose that any guarantee can be perfect. It is plain that the temporal sovereignty, such as it has hitherto existed, was never more than a very partial and meagre security of Papal independence. There are quite as many theoretical objections to it as to the free church in a free state.

"The local sovereignty," says Dr. Manning, "is over that state, territory, and people which the Providence of God has committed to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. No one can read its history without perceiving that it was given by the same Divine will and the same Divine hand from which he received also his personal sovereignty in the beginning, and was liberated from all subjection." I do not quite understand whether Dr. Manning means that this local sovereignty exists by the same *divine right* as the personal sovereignty; he declares in this passage that the personal sovereignty existed "in the beginning," that it was as perfect in the martyr-popes in the Catacombs as in the Sovereign Pontiffs in the Vatican,—as real in St. Gregory the Great, who acknowledged himself the subject of the Emperor Maurice, as in St. Gregory VII., who asked all the monarchs of Europe to acknowledge themselves his vassals. The personal sovereignty of the Popes, then, is an immutable element, existing from the beginning; but the local sovereignty has gradually accrued, has grown up from nothing, and has been subject to many vicissitudes in all ages since it began. I do not see, then, how the two sovereignties can be compared. One is the body, the other the raiment; one the substance, the other the accident; one unchanging, or only once or twice betrayed by such weakness as that of Liberius, the other only a thousand years old at the most, and perpetually subject to interruption and variation. Yet I can hardly suppose that Dr. Manning only means that, since whatever authority exists upon earth is from God, therefore the

local sovereignty of the Pope is from God; and that, as God is one, this local sovereignty exists by the same Will and Hand as that which established the personal sovereignty and independence of the Supreme Pastor. The principle is so true that it is a truism; it is so universal that its application to a given case confers no peculiarity on that case. And the history of the changes through which the local sovereignty has passed, till it has reached its present state (whether of progress or of dissolution, who knows?), is a strange substructure for the argument that this variable is henceforth to be invariable, this accident henceforth to be substance, this temporary to be eternal. Dr. Manning's logic is so remarkable as almost to defy analysis. He divides the Papal sovereignty into its two elements, the personal and the local; the first original, and unchangeable from the beginning, the second wanting in early times, then gradually accumulating round the personal sovereignty, and through rough vicissitudes growing to the form it assumed in the sixteenth century. And therefore "this order divinely founded, divinely unfolded, and divinely sustained," in Dr. Manning's belief, can never be dissolved. Does he, then, believe that whatever God founds, unfolds, and sustains can never be dissolved? That in this mutable world He is bound to do always what He does once? By the same rule, He would have been bound to make Judaism eternal, to keep the Church perpetually in the state of martyrdom, or to stereotype her in the form into which St. Gregory VII. fashioned her. But it is absurd to conclude that because past changes have been very wonderful and very providential, therefore there will never be any future change at all. If Dr. Manning was contented that this prophetic anticipation should not pass for more than it is, namely, a private belief of his own, no one would have any right to blame him. But it will appear in the sequel that he goes much beyond this.

The personal sovereignty of the Pope may exist though the Pope has no local sovereignty, as it did in Nero's days, and its existence is not imperilled by being recognised by the sovereign of Rome, as it was under Constantine and Charlemagne. For after Charlemagne had given a kind of regal state to the Pope, the Roman people still took the oath of allegiance to the emperor. Now what kind of prince can we call him whose subjects swear allegiance to another monarch? When Louis le Débonnaire ceded certain territories to the Pope, he expressly and stringently reserved them under the imperial supremacy by the very charter which confirmed them. What kind of sovereignty was the Pope's local sovereignty over these? The same charter expressly recognises

the perfect independence of the Pope, and thus apparently sets up cross jurisdictions. But the distinction between the Pope's personal sovereignty and his local rule, between his ecclesiastical supremacy and his political subordination, will explain the apparent confusion.

The Constitution of Charlemagne is that to which Montalembert appeals; and the Roman liturgy still embalms the memory of this golden age. Now Leo III., who restored the empire in Charlemagne, did not withdraw Rome from the empire, but made it the pivot of its power; the Cæsar was Emperor of the Romans: all that Leo did was, as Innocent III. said of him, to transfer the Roman empire from the Greeks to the Franks. He changed the dynasty; he did not suppress or alter the rights of the emperor. The Romans prayed for their emperor in their liturgy; and afterwards none of the Popes who most distinctly claimed either a feudal suzerainty or a civil supremacy by divine right over all Christian princes, ever went on to alter these liturgical forms.* We may still read in the Roman Missal the prayers for "our emperor," and for "the holy Roman empire," though they were apparently made void of meaning by the abolition of that empire in 1806. But then the Popes have not recognised that abolition; for on the failure of the Congress of Vienna to restore it in 1815, Cardinal Consalvi wrote a letter and protest, June 14, 1815, and Pope Pius VII. made an allocution to the same effect September 4th in the same year.

The truth is, that the importance of the Roman empire to the Church is one of the ancient traditions of Christendom. Our Lord's promise to St. Peter is held to secure the permanence of his power and sovereignty to his successors in his chair at Rome; but also the power which hinders the advent of Antichrist to destroy that chair is, by a tradition, almost as universally held to be the Roman empire. The Church, then, has been as anxious as the sovereigns of Europe that the empire should never really be dissolved, but should always be upheld by one or another representative of Augustus. And Sir Francis Palgrave speaks like a Christian doctor when he calls the political and moral unity of the ancient empire of the Cæsars of Rome, and of the medieval holy Roman empire, "the great truth upon which the whole history of European society, and more than European society, European

* I am speaking of the prayers for the emperor. A remarkable change has been made in the Collect for the Office of St. Peter's Chair. It once stood, "Deus qui beato Petro collatis clavibus regni cœlestis, *animas* ligandi atque solvendi pontificium tradidisti," &c. But since the time of Gregory XIII. the word *animas* has been omitted in Missals and Breviaries.

civilisation, depends." The Church and the world are equally interested that the Roman empire should still be considered living, and the nature of this interest is exemplified by the protection which the Pope even now enjoys under the wings of the eagles which claim to represent the ancient standards of the Roman legions.* But if the Church proclaims that the Roman empire still lives, she virtually proclaims the authority *de facto* or *de jure* of the emperor over the population of Rome. The authority may be dormant, but it clearly cannot be maintained without its being subject to the contingency of a periodical revival at the expense of the local sovereignty of the Pope.

And it seems to me that this is treated in the canon law as the normal condition of the relation between Pope and emperor. That law is based upon the supposition that an emperor of the Romans exists, and that he is the political head of Italy. Look at the decree of Leo III., in Gratian, canon, *tibi Domine*, xxxiii. dis. 63, and at that of Innocent III., in the decretals of Gregory IX., cap. 4. There are passages of Clement V. and of St. Antoninus to the same effect, besides the allocution of Pius VII., to which I have already referred. A sign of the oblivion which now obscures the principles of canon law may be found in the popularity of a novel title of the Pope, *il Papa-Re*. It is not only Garibaldi and About who invidiously give him this name, but also the donors of Peter's pence, whose gifts are advertised in the *Armonia*. Yet this title is not only unknown to canon law, but completely opposed to its spirit. Pope St. Gelasius formally repudiated the title of king, and Gratian, Dec. p. 1. dis. 2, can. 1, cites authorities who pronounce it to be incongruous and false. Cardinal Peter d'Ailly wrote a treatise against it.

If the question of the Pope's local sovereignty was considered merely in a political aspect, or on the side of natural right and justice, this appeal to old laws would be mere antiquarian trifling. But if the local sovereignty is made a question of faith, then antiquities become at once part of the evidence. The faith is substantially unchangeable; whatever is believed now was implicitly believed in the first ages; the seed was there from which, and not from a foreign graft, the plant has grown. The ecclesiastical dicta of former ages need not explicitly contain all that is now of faith; but I suppose that they cannot contain the explicit contradiction of any thing that is now, or ever will be, matter of formal dogma. Old canons, therefore, however forgotten, are not altogether

* Cardinal Pacca thought that the revival of the empire by Napoleon I. might render the temporal power altogether unnecessary.

obliterated; they may be no longer laws to be obeyed, but they will always be sufficient proof that what they impugn cannot be made matter of faith, or assumed to be part of the tradition handed down from the beginning *semper, ubique et ab omnibus*.

It was thus that the late Cardinal Lewicki, Archbishop of Lemberg, in his pastoral of March 10, 1841, quoted with marvellous effect from the old Slavonic liturgies statements about the Popes which the unhappy Ruthenians were being tortured into denying. The Russian Church was put to shame for persecuting opinions which it once held, and still praised. So our old books countenance the opinion that the Pope is not king by divine right, and may owe allegiance to the emperor without damage to his personal sovereignty. Therefore such an opinion must be at least consistent with faith.

But Dr. Manning hardly allows this. "Now," he says, "the law of the temporal sovereignty has become a law of the conscience, an axiom of the reason. Like the great dogmas of the Church, through controversy it has reached its analysis and expression. It stands by the side of the Immaculate Conception, a theological certainty, if not a definition. . . . From the whole episcopate of the Church has come one universal acclamation of faith in the temporal sovereignty of the Vicar of Jesus Christ as a divine institution upon earth. The consent of the pastors and their flocks witnesses to this deep Catholic instinct, and the voice of the episcopate raises it to a judgment of the Church, and furnishes the material for a more solemn utterance." Surely, in so important a matter, Dr. Manning should have more explicitly told us whether it is the personal sovereignty alone, or the local sovereignty alone, or the compound of the two, and if the last, in which of its numerous phases, that, as a doctrine and law of the conscience, is a counterpart to the Immaculate Conception, a theological certainty, if not a definition, and a judgment of the Church. The definition should be very precisely given, in order that we might know who are good Catholics and who bad, who orthodox and who heterodox. To leave the matter undefined, is to set a snare for the conscience. It is not for a moment to be supposed that Dr. Manning purposely abstained from making his meaning clear in order to make his readers think he meant more than he really intended, and to terrify them with obscurity and mystery. Yet there may be persons whom Dr. Manning will make afraid that, in order to be good Catholics, they must believe something which in fact they need not, and which they

cannot bring themselves to believe. These immediately suppose themselves bad Catholics; then they lose their fervour, and soon become what they suppose themselves. If this view of Dr. Manning's were matter of faith, most Catholics would be heretics, for few believe it as of faith. This ought to be the *reductio ad absurdum* of his whole argument. It is intolerable to brand people with a bad name, which tends to make them what it expresses; for they who are called bad Catholics unquestionably are in much danger of becoming so. There is no scandal more mischievous than this, none which good men should be more careful to eschew. When even Dr. Manning places such stones in his brethren's path, what will reckless and imprudent disputants do? He may be convinced that he ought to believe that God has fused the personal and local sovereignties into an indiscerptible whole, never to be divided; but who authorised him to imply that all who do not agree with him err from the faith? May I be permitted to express a doubt whether he agrees with himself? I do not think he would go so far as to refuse absolution to a penitent, otherwise orthodox, who only persisted in denying the necessity of the Pope's local sovereignty.

I have shown that before the Pope's right to a perfectly independent local sovereignty is made an article of faith, there are canons to be scratched out, Papal rescripts to be amended, and liturgies to be revised. Can this be done? I know that there were some similar difficulties in the way of the definition of the present beatific vision of the Saints by the Council of Constance, but I doubt whether the difficulties were equal. Besides, that was a question about invisible things, matters of pure faith and revelation; the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, on the contrary, is a visible fact in the natural order, like the sovereignty of other princes, and placed by the Holy Father himself upon nearly the same footing as that of Francis II. over Naples. It is equally unlike the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which is also an invisible fact in the supernatural order. And there is no real similarity in the way in which the two doctrines have been promulgated: about the Immaculate Conception there was a true "consent of pastors with their flocks;" about the temporal sovereignty I do not think that any such consent has been shown to exist. Now I speak under correction; but is it not necessary, do not the Papal decrees require, that the laity*

* Pope Nicholas I. to the Emperor Michael, in 865, see Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 112, nos. 265, &c.: "Where have you read that your imperial predecessors sat in synods? Except, perhaps, in those where they treated of faith, which is universal, which is all men's in common, which belongs not only to the clergy, but to the laity as well, and universally to all Christians."

should be taken account of as well as the clergy in defining matters of faith?

My readers will see that I am not arguing against the Pope's local sovereignty, but against its being assumed to be an article of faith, or on the point of becoming so. The fact itself may be one for which it is glorious to make every personal sacrifice, even to loss of life; yet for all this it is a question, not of faith, but of ecclesiastical politics, of prudence and foresight, in which good men may take opposite sides without a slur upon their orthodoxy. The controversy is not one of faith, of interpretations of Scripture, and of prophecy, but of history and political prudence. Is the local sovereignty such a guarantee as it is assumed to be? Is it real when the Pope can only exercise it under the protection of foreigners? Is he not dependent on those who alone secure his independence of his own subjects? Hundreds of such questions may be asked without any heretical bias.

I am aware that in the theologians of the Middle Ages will be found a view similar to Dr. Manning's: Boniface VIII. proclaimed the divine right of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope over all earthly crowns. Yet, not only was his theory never realised, but the attempt to carry it out was the cause of the decline of the Papal power in Europe which began after his reign. If it failed in those days, when the clergy were still supreme in knowledge, and when they had the power which immense possessions gave them, how much more now! The theory grew naturally from the aspirations which the possibilities of the time suggested; and it seems only to deserve consideration when viewed, in the light of that age, as a question of history. As a doctrine claiming our respect it is confronted with another theory, defined with equal distinctness and by equal authorities; and as this other theory is the only one that has stood the test of events and the light of day, there is certainly no presumption of religiousness in favour of the view taken by Dr. Manning. This theory ruined the Popes once, and drove them into captivity; what will it do now? Even if it were true speculatively,—and I deny that it is so, but I suppose it for argument's sake,—is this the time to put it forward? is this the age to be called “the period of the temporal sovereignty,” seeing the effect its assertion must have on Protestants, and on the vast majority of Catholics, especially Catholic scholars, who deny it?*

* I was surprised to see in a recent volume of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii* a republication and reassertion of the thesis of a Polish professor of the seventeenth century, which claimed in the strongest terms for the Pope by divine right the temporal supremacy over all civil governments. I think it occurs in vol. iv. of the collection.

it wise thus to divide the really faithful into two classes, when we need united forces? What practical good *can* the theory do? It certainly may do much harm. It is enough practically if all Catholics are convinced that the Pope must be free by some means—as I may say, by hook or by crook.

The use of the local sovereignty is to guarantee this freedom; and the use of this freedom is, that the Pope should be untrammelled in his great work of directing the families of men in matters of faith and morals. If no families of men obeyed him, his freedom would be useless, and its guarantee worthless. To risk such a misfortune for the sake of preserving the guarantee, would be like throwing away the jewel to keep the casket, destroying the soul to save the body.

P.

Correspondence.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

SIR,—Will you allow me to offer a few remarks on an able and interesting paper, which has appeared in your September Number, discussing the question of identity in spirit and system between our great public schools and universities of to-day and their former selves when Catholic? I need scarcely say that I am not going to re-open the controversy, which has already been closed in your pages, as to the respective merits of the present public-school system and that which usually prevails in Catholic, especially Continental, colleges; but shall confine myself to the collateral question of fact, which is now for the first time directly mooted, as to which may most fairly be considered the modern representative of the institutions of Wykeham or Waynflete. And if I am not able to acquiesce, without further information, in all “A. M. D. G.’s” conclusions, he must not suppose me insensible to the valuable service he has rendered, by throwing additional light on the subject, or to the tone of candour and discrimination in which he has treated it. With much of what he says I heartily agree; but on some points his judgment appears to me at least premature, and his data insufficient for the inferences he has deduced from them. Let me proceed at once to explain my reasons for thinking so.

1. In the first place, no account of any such corporate organisation, which is mainly or entirely derived from the letter of its statutes, can be other than a most inadequate picture of its actual life. This is true even of contemporary institutions. The sound statesman-like judgment of the late Bishop Doyle seems, oddly enough, to have conceived the possibility of uniting the Irish Church

Establishment to the Catholic Church by a kind of parliamentary *coup de main*, because he looked at the Establishment *ab extra*, and judged it simply by the letter of its formularies. Consider, again, how strange, and even ludicrous, a misconception of Oxford life would be gathered from an exclusive study of the University Statutes, still in force, and a copy of which is, or lately used to be, presented to every undergraduate on his matriculation. But I need not multiply illustrations of what is sufficiently obvious. We all know how different a system looks on paper from that same system worked out by living men. Modifications, additions, and subtractions invariably grow up in practice almost before the ink of the original rules is dry, and much more in the lapse of ages. To attempt, then, to reproduce the life of Eton or Winchester in the fifteenth century from the letter of their statutes, would be somewhat analogous to the paradoxical attempt of a distinguished historian to re-write the reigns of the Tudors from contemporary acts of Parliament and their preambles. I am not saying that your contributor has done this ; but he has certainly had mainly to rely for his conclusions on the letter of statutes, while of the other authorities he quotes some tell partly against him. Nor are there wanting, I believe, many records of medieval Oxford life, which, like the "Reeves Tale," betray a state of disorder and immorality that would not be tolerated for a day under its present discipline, which I observe "A. M. D. G." considers quite sufficient for youths of the age placed under it. The state of things described by Chaucer may no doubt have been improved by subsequent collegiate rules ; but one would be glad to know the extent and nature of the changes which actually took place. The discontented Cambridge scholar cannot surely be held to give a fair statement of average university life.

To revert to the statutes. They, of course, deal more with external regulations than with principles, and it must be remembered that the question of identity is mainly one of principle. Apart from all religious considerations, many changes of detail would necessarily occur in the course of years with the changes of national and social life generally. To reënact for a school of our own day the precise regulations of Winchester at its first origin, would not be to copy the work of Wykeham, but to caricature it. For similar reasons, the evidence of statutes must possess a chiefly negative value. Your contributor can hardly be wrong in inferring, from their significant silence, the absence of any system of *espionage*,—for that is a point pretty certain to have been legislated for, if intended to be carried out,—and the omission is highly important ; but it would not be equally safe to limit the exact amount of liberty enjoyed by the boys to the literal permissions of the statutes, nor do they enable us to decide how far, *e g.*, the "sense of honour" was appealed to as a motive power. It is in such points, however, that the gist of the question lies to a great extent. The medieval knight was a very different personage from the modern gentleman, yet the one is the lineal descendant and representative of the other. The specialities of

chivalry pass away ; but tenderness, honour, and manhood are an imperishable bequest. Perhaps the question, under some at least of its aspects, might be stated thus : Did the system of our public schools and universities stand in the same relation to the chivalrous ideal of the fourteenth century as it now stands to the gentleman-like ideal of the nineteenth ?

2. There is, moreover, a special consideration in the case of collegiate statutes for which "A. M. D. G." appears to me not to have made sufficient allowance, though he has in one passage referred to it. Were they not mainly, if not entirely, enacted for the regulation of *foundationers*? This is a point which requires to be carefully noticed, when we consider that, probably from early times, the *peregrini*, who were from the first contemplated (at least in the foundation of Eton), outnumbered the foundation-boys ; and if the resident body in an Oxford college were mainly composed of those on the foundation, it can only have been because the immense majority of students did not live in colleges at all. It must also be remembered that the foundationers formed an ecclesiastical, one might even say in the case of the universities a quasi-monastic, corporation, as is evidenced by the obligation to take holy orders imposed on most of them. If, then, the statutes were mainly designed for *them*, they cannot surely be accepted, without great reserve, as representing the educational ideal of their day for the mass of self-supporting and of non-ecclesiastical students.

3. Has your contributor given sufficient prominence to all points of similarity between our ancient and modern public schools, which may be gathered even from his own references to the statutes? He speaks in one place of the monitorial or fagging system as though it were a special creation of Dr. Arnold's. Yet he must surely be aware that Dr. Arnold only developed and utilised for good an instrument he found ready-made, and which had, in fact, existed all along at our public schools. It is difficult, I think, to read the Eton statute, which he quotes (p. 356), without recognising in it something more than the mere germ of that monitorial system which has become one of the most distinctive features of the public schools. The duty of superintending, punishing, and, in certain cases, "denouncing" to the head-master, is still recognised and acted on. At some schools (I believe at Winchester) the monitors enforce silence for a certain time night and morning in the dormitories and rooms for private prayer. No doubt their powers may be, and often have been, greatly abused, and it may be admitted that it is in a great measure through Dr. Arnold's influence that they have come to be again directed to moral and religious ends. But the framework of the system was there all along, constituting a marked point of identity with its Catholic prototype, and of divergence from its Catholic contemporaries.

Before quitting this statute, I am tempted to ask whether, in translating *magistrum informatorem* "prefect of discipline," your contributor is not transferring to the foundation of Eton the ideas

of a different system and a later age. I speak under correction ; but *magister informator* is the technical term for the *head-master* at most of our public schools,—a very different officer from the prefect of discipline of a modern Catholic college, and the head-master of Eton is surely the natural person to be mentioned next after the provost and vice-provost.

4. Your contributor is startled at the notion of the present condition of our public schools being “a development, or even perversion,” of their Catholic antecedents, and laughs at the idea of the present Catholic college system having “dropped from the clouds” at the time of the Reformation. Yet it is surely far more startling, to me it seems well-nigh inconceivable, that any thing like the “present Catholic theory of education” should have been *silently* changed at the Reformation into any thing like the present public-school system. If so momentous a revolution took place, and that in a nation so doggedly conservative as England, there must be some records of it left. I do not say there are none ; but if there are any, let them be produced. The fact noticed by “A. M. D. G.” (p. 354), that one of the most “monastic” statutes of Winchester was still in force at the beginning of the last century, hardly looks like it. Nor is it at all necessary to suppose the modern Catholic system dropped from the clouds at the Reformation, when we recollect that it is elaborately formed on the Jesuit model, and that the Jesuits became at that period, and continued for some time afterwards, the leading educators of Catholic Europe. They were not likely to borrow much from the educational antecedents of a country of which they knew little or nothing, except that it had lapsed into heresy, and was, if possible, to be reclaimed to the faith.

These, then, are some of my reasons for going beyond your contributor in considering, as at present informed, the modern public-school and university systems, on the whole, and after due allowance has been made for the social and intellectual progress of four centuries, the truest living representatives of the ancient English ideal. The *onus probandi* lies on those who think differently. Clearly so ; for it is natural to assume, unless proof be forthcoming to the contrary, that in all matters not directly affected by the religious changes of the sixteenth century, the Eton and Winchester of to-day would be the rightful lineal descendants of their original selves, rather than Stonyhurst or Ushaw. It is natural, first, because we can trace the one system historically to an English, the other to a foreign, origin ; secondly, because, as was said above, it is gratuitous to imagine that a flood arose in the night, and swept away all traces of the ancient landmarks “while men slept,” leaving no memorial behind it. Of the religious changes in the sixteenth century we have ample records. Do they speak of any thing beyond ?

There are one or two subordinate points in which I might be disposed to join issue with “A. M. D. G.” I think, for instance, he scarcely does justice to the direct religious influences brought to bear in our public schools. When he ridicules the notion of the sancti-

fication of their members being made their *finis ultimus* of education, he might remember that the head-master of one of the largest of them (Rugby) tells us, in the dedication of a recent volume of school sermons, that "he would gladly sacrifice all else to train up his boys in the spirit of the Bible." But I do not purpose dwelling on these matters. I have wished to confine myself to the historical question; and in doing so, my aim has been, not so much to offer fresh information, as to indicate what seems to be the general lie of the question, in the hope of eliciting new matter, if any is to be had, from those who may be in a position to supply it.

One or two extracts, however, shall be added in reference to our foreign seminaries, tending to show that the discipline was alien to the habits and character of Englishmen, and was not found altogether successful with them.

Among many complaints recorded by Father Parsons of the English youth at Rome, take the following: "Cardinal Baronius often told me that our youths bragged much of their martyrdoms; but they were *refractarii* (that was his word), and had no part of the martyr's spirit, which was charity and obedience. His Holiness often told me that he never was so vexed with any nation in the world. For on the one side they pretended piety and zeal, and on the other showed the very spirit of the devil in pride, contumacy, and contradiction. . . . His Holiness added also, that he knew not what resolution to take; for, on the one side, to punish them openly would be a scandal, by reason of the heretics; and if he would cast them forth of Rome, some had told him they would become heretics. . . . So as now many great and wise men begin to suspect that the sufferings of our blessed martyrs and confessors in England was not so much for virtue and love of God, as of certain choler and obstinate will to contradict the magistrates there."

There is much more to the same effect. This is, of course, the Italian view of the matter; but it any how implies that the right method of dealing with the English character had not been hit upon. Parsons accounts for it by the tender age at which the English students came to Rome, and the contrast between the English and Italian systems of education. In Italy, boys were at an early age initiated into matters that only men knew in England, and discussed the affairs of popes, cardinals, and princes. Hence "our youths, that were bred up at home with much more simplicity, and kept under by their parents and masters more than the Italian education doth comport, easily forget themselves, and break out into liberty." The English was the parental system; the Italian system made men out of boys by a precocious development of their intellect, and then restrained them from sins of which English boys knew nothing, by a constant supervision and espionage, against which our young countrymen revolted.

We find, again, in Dr. H. Ely's *Answer to the Apology of the Priests united to the Archpriest* (British Museum, Harleian Mss. 1875, p. 213), an account of the various "stirs" in the English Col-

lege, in one of which half the students left and joined the Benedictines. Another "stir," the account of which will not bear quotation, arose from certain measures of precaution and espionage implying suspicion of gross and disgusting immorality.

Take, on the other hand, the following account by an Italian, who wrote from Parsons' notes, of one result of the English plan of education founded on honour (Bartoli, *Istoria de la Comp. de Gesu: l'Inghilterra*, p. 106). It refers to 1580: "They (the Catholic priests) trusted more to the reputation of a Protestant, but a gentleman, than to the conscience of a plebeian, though he professed to be a Catholic; and with reason, as experience demonstrated, far beyond all that men had a right to expect. For not from noble blood, which hated infamy more than death, but from the common herd, sprang those monstrous traitors, snarers, spies, false accusers, perjured witnesses, who have been written about so much that I need not write more of them here. Men as vile in mind as in origin; shameless apostates, domestic traitors; brought to their infamous trade, not by any doubt of the Catholic religion, but by the unhappy pelf they made by marketing their faith, and by selling the blood of priests and the lives of innocent Catholics to the parsons and persecutors."

But I will not further multiply extracts which have only an indirect, though a very obvious, bearing on the question.

Your obedient servant,

A.

CANON FLANAGAN ON THE LIFE OF EDMUND CAMPION.

SIR,—If I had known that a grave fault would have been imputed to the *Rambler* because I made no reply to certain criticisms of the very Rev. Canon Flanagan, in a letter printed in the *Weekly Register* and the *Tablet* of May 11, upon two passages of the third chapter of my *Life of Campion*, I should certainly have noticed them before; and I now hasten to repair my fault, if fault it is, by an explanation.

And first, if any one is to blame, it is not the Editor of the *Rambler*. The passages criticised appeared among the "Communicated Articles," where opinions and representations are advanced, as in the "Correspondence," by the writers in their private capacity, and where "only such general responsibility is undertaken by the conductors as is involved in their being parties to the publication." This announcement was made in the clearest terms in your prospectus of May 1859, where also admission was promised to articles and letters, not otherwise objectionable, that take a contrary view, or even controvert the opinions advanced. I cannot suppose that any such letter of Canon Flanagan has ever been refused admission into the *Rambler*; and it seems rather hard to expect the

conductors to note and to reply to all the criticisms which may appear in other journals.*

The reasons which prevented me from replying arose from the subject itself. I was blamed for "shallow reasoning" and bad criticism, because I quoted Hall's *Chronicle* to prove that both clergy and laity neglected to observe a general fast ordered by Wolsey in 1527, and that the laity called the Pope by an opprobrious name because he had meddled in politics. Canon Flanagan thinks this shallow because Hall writes "in a style palatable to the Reformers," and "takes every opportunity to vilify the Popes." But here it is not the Pope, but the English clergy and laity, that Hall was vilifying. These persons were notoriously disaffected to the Pope a few years later; and Hall is perfectly good evidence of their disaffection in 1527. The objection needed no answer.

With regard to the next charge. "Now for the specimen of historical facts. We are actually treated to the old story, that Elizabeth made known her accession to Pope Paul IV., and that the latter replied she was a bastard, and had insulted him. This story might have been told and believed some twenty years ago. Lingard and Tierney were both misled by it; but as both acknowledged their mistake, what are we to think of a writer who could thus deliberately repeat it?" The obvious thing is, to think that he was ignorant of Lingard and Tierney's acknowledgment, not that he deliberately repeated an exploded error. The story is one which appears first in Sarpi, then in Pallavicino, in Raynaldus, the continuator of Baronius, and I suppose in every Catholic historian down to the latest times. *Canon Tierney rejects it in the advertisement to his fourth volume of Dod's *Church History*, on the authority of certain researches among the English archives made by Mr. Howard, of Corby. If I had known of these, I certainly should not have repeated the story, though I must own that whatever doubt they throw on it, they seem quite insufficient to prove it to be a pure fabrication, due only to the inventive powers of Father Paul Sarpi. I should never reaffirm the story without further evidence; but, on the other hand, it seems equally hard to deny it positively and in all points.

Sarpi's story is this: "Elizabeth had her accession notified to the Pope by letters of credence written to Edward Carne, who had acted as her sister Mary's ambassador with the Pope. But the Pope, with his usual temper, answers that the realm of England is a fief of the Apostolic See; that she, as a bastard, cannot succeed to the crown, and that he could not reverse the definitions of Clement VII. and Paul III.; that it was unbearable audacity to assume the name of queen or the government of the realm without his approbation, and that she had deserved, by so doing, that he should utterly refuse to listen to her demands. But because he wished to act like a father to his flock, provided Elizabeth would consent to re-

* Our correspondent is right. Canon Flanagan has never written to us on the subject.—ED.

nounce her right, as she pretends, to the English crown, and would leave herself freely to his decision, he would do whatever was consistent with the dignity of the Apostolic See. Most people believed that the interference of the French king had contributed to the ill-feeling of the Pope ; for he feared that the Pope would grant a dispensation for a new marriage between the King of Spain and the Queen of England, and he thought it would be his best policy to cut the strings in the very beginning of the negotiation. But the queen, when she knew what the Pope had answered, wondered at the hasty temper of the harsh old man, and thought it best both for herself and her realm to have no further dealings with him."

There is no doubt that in its technical details this story is false from beginning to end. The documents published by Mr. Howard show that Carne never received official news of the queen's death, never received letters of credence from the queen, and therefore never officially communicated her accession to the Pope ; and therefore, again, never received the official reply given by Sarpi. It is true that the French began to intrigue at Rome immediately after Mary's death, and it is true also that Philip II. almost as quickly conceived the idea of marrying Elizabeth, and spoke of it at Rome.* It is true also that in general Paul IV. placed all his hopes in the French, and was inclined to listen to them.† But it is not true that Carne was expressly recalled from Rome on account of the Pope's having given this answer, nor, indeed, does Sarpi say that he was. He only says that when the reply became known—*comperto*—to the queen, she ceased to have dealings with Rome.

But is there any probability that there were any indirect dealings with Rome in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, the conduct of which has been erroneously attributed to Carne ? Or is it likely that Carne himself received such a reply while cautiously exploring the feelings of the Roman Court about Elizabeth ? In the event of such a reply having been given non-officially to Carne, would he be likely to report it officially to his government ? Would it not more probably reach the English Court through the ordinary means of its low spies and intelligencers ? And lastly, is there any proof in Carne's letters that such a speech was not made ?

And first, with regard to the probability of indirect dealings with the Pope. Elizabeth's Roman policy from the beginning was double : publicly, to disown and affect complete ignorance of all the Pontifical decisions respecting her illegitimacy, because to take the public initiative in getting them reversed would be, she thought, to make an acknowledgment of their importance, and even validity, which was quite incompatible with her safety ; and, privately, to leave no stone unturned to induce the Pope voluntarily to annul the decisions against her, for she knew well the danger to which they would continually expose her. Thus she acted in 1570, after the publication of the sentence of St. Pius V. ; "which sentence," says

* Raynaldus, cont. of Baronius, ad an. 1559, i.

† Soranzo, in tom. x. of Alberi's *Relazioni Venete*, p. 57.

Theiner,* “though she made show of contemning and mocking, yet she sufficiently acknowledged its force when she had recourse to the Emperor that, at his prayer, it might be revoked by the Pope.” St. Pius, however, replied to Maximilian: “We cannot quite understand why she makes so much ado about the sentence. For if she thinks much of our excommunication, why does she not return to the bosom of mother Church? But if she thinks it of no consequence, why does she make so much ado about it?” Had Sarpi before him any documentary proof of such an indirect negotiation of Elizabeth with Paul IV., if not through Carne, through some other agent?

Next, suppose any such indirect communication had taken place, or suppose only that Carne had been discreetly exploring the opinion of the Court about English affairs, is it probable, is it consistent with the known character of Paul IV., to suppose that he would have made such a reply? Any one that reads the accounts given of him by Soranzo and Mocinego, the Venetian envoys at his Court, in Alberi’s collection of *Relazioni*, will see the verisimilitude of the story. The Pope used to say, “that the dignity of the Pontiff consisted in putting kings and emperors under his feet;” he “wished to be feared by kings and emperors, showing by his frequent discourses how little he thought of any one of them, and saying that the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, was lord of all temporal princes.” The speech was so much in Paul’s manner, that all succeeding Catholic historians have copied it from Sarpi without a doubt of its truth, and sometimes with an acknowledgment of its special propriety. “Ille” (Paul), says Raynaldus, “ut erat juris Pontificii assertor acerrimus, respondit,” &c.

But now suppose, in the course of his non-official communication with the Roman *curia*, Carne had received such a reply, would he have transmitted it to his Court? The wary old man (*solers senex*), as Camden calls him, knew better. Just at the same moment, a less-experienced ambassador was receiving a severe reprimand from the English Council for reporting these very intrigues of the French. Howard, one of the English commissioners for concluding the Peace of Cambresis, wrote to the Council, March 2, 1559, that a new difficulty had emerged; that the French had suggested to the Spaniards a doubt whether Elizabeth was rightful queen, and whether the Queen of Scots was not true queen of England; and that the French were labouring at Rome to the Pope for the disabling of her highness to the crown, and intitling of the Queen of Scots thereto. To this despatch there are two answers among the records. In one the queen blames them for making “mention of matters touching our title, such as we cannot like any ways to hear of;” and Cecil adds, “we think it very strange that ye will attempt to write to us thereof in such manner as it seemeth ye do, and to seek to know our pleasure in such a matter, which ye ought neither to hear of nor to reason.” In the second despatch the Council answer, “Truly, my lord,

* *Annales Ecclesiastici*, tom. iii. p. 596.

we be sorry to see the queen's majesty, our undoubted liege lady, to be thus spoken of, and think the matter neither *worth hearing nor answer*: . . . articulation of such a matter is nothing agreeable to your commissions, nor convenient for you to hear of." This shows what sarcastic point and truth there is in what Shakespeare makes Parson Evans say to Justice Shallow: "It is not meet the council hear a riot. There is no fear of God in a riot. The council, look you, shall desire to hear the fear of God, and not to hear a riot." Now Carne, both as a Catholic would be unwilling to make an irreparable breach between Elizabeth and the Pope, and as a wily old ambassador would be more knowing than to send home information which would only gain him a reprimand. So he did like other ambassadors of his time: he prophesied smooth things, he exaggerated the respect that was paid to him in his official capacity, and he ignored as far as possible every demonstration of contrary character. Mocinego's report, above referred to, is a case in point. It is amusing to hear him carefully explaining to the Council of Venice that, however rough Paul IV. might be to the ambassadors of the other powers, yet he was all sweetness with the Venetian envoy, who, though he got very few audiences, yet had more than any other.

But if such a speech had been made in the Roman Court, it would probably get to the ears of other ambassadors, through whom it might reach the English Council, either directly through their governments, or indirectly through the eavesdropping of intelligencers. Elizabeth might have heard of it, and acted upon it, without mentioning it in the correspondence with Carne.

Lastly, the facts that Carne narrates are not inconsistent with the speech attributed to the Pope by Sarpi. Carne writes, Feb. 16, 1559: "The French here *can obtain nothing* at his Holiness's hands against your Majesty; and his Holiness hath such respect to your majesty and to your realms, that *he will attempt nothing* against you or your realms unless the occasion be first given therehence, as I am credibly informed." The French were trying to get the Pope to "disable Elizabeth to the crown, and to entitle the Queen of Scots thereto." Carne reports that they could obtain nothing, and that the Pope would attempt nothing of the kind. On the other hand, the speech reported by Sarpi has no reference to the French intrigues, but only to the supposed indirect solicitations of Elizabeth that the Pope would voluntarily acknowledge her right to the throne, thereby tacitly repealing the definitions of Clement VII. and Paul III. The Pope angrily refused to do this, but offered pretty plainly, if Elizabeth would renounce her right *de jure*,—that is, would acknowledge the justice of the decisions of those other Popes,—to acknowledge her as *de facto* queen. This was just what the French did not want; they wanted to see Mary of Scotland, and her husband the Dauphin, on the English throne. So that in this respect Carne's report agrees in substance with that of Sarpi. The French, in spite of their influence with the Pope, had not gained what they wanted

—the disabling Elizabeth to the crown ; but perhaps they had succeeded in so incensing Paul IV. against her that he made the violent and indiscreet speech recorded by Sarpi.

On the whole, then, I conclude that, though the technical detail of Sarpi's story is clearly false, nothing has as yet been shown which proves that he had no foundation for the substance of it. We may easily suppose that the historian pieced up his story out of different documents. If he found a paper which recorded that Elizabeth's agent at Rome, in the beginning of her reign, received such an answer, he would supply from other documents the name of Carne ; he would naturally surmise, from the general practice, that the answer was given in reply to a notification of the queen's accession, and he would dress up the story in its probable raiment, as all other historians of his time would do. This raiment has been torn to tatters by Mr. Howard. The substance of the story remains, not clear of suspicion, but not disproved ; and we must await the publication of the documents relating to the history of the Council of Trent, long ago prepared for the press by Father Theiner, but unaccountably delayed or countermanded, and of those Venetian papers which Sarpi made use of, before we are entitled to pronounce it to be a pure fabrication.

These, then, are the reasons which prevented me from accepting Canon Flanagan's criticisms ; and they would still have prevented me from replying, if I had not learned that my silence was prejudicial to the *Rambler*.

THE WRITER OF THE LIFE OF EDMUND CAMPION.

Literary Notice.

Japan, the Amoor, and the Pacific. A Voyage of Circumnavigation in the Imperial Russian Corvette "Rynda," 1858-1860. By H. A. Tilley. (London : Smith, Elder, and Co.)—We only notice this able and well-written book in order to extract from it Mr. Tilley's account of the Catholic authorities in the island of Tahiti, the natives of which had been converted by English Methodists before it was taken under the French Protectorate in 1842. It was then expressly stipulated that the English missionaries should not be molested in their functions ; still the French government was acting within its rights when it resolved to assimilate the ecclesiastical system of Tahiti to that of France, which places the clergy under the control of the civil power by forcing the ministers of all denominations to be stipendiaries of the state. It therefore subjected the Protestant missionaries to the same rule as the Catholics ; and ordered each to settle in his own district, and receive a fixed salary from the state, instead of wandering from district to district, and drawing their means of support from the contributions of their

various congregations. All but two refused to submit to these terms, and left their flocks in charge of native ministers.

How were the French Catholic clergy to deal with a half-civilised Protestant community, thus left to its own internal resources? The method actually adopted is this. "The government is as tolerant and protective to Protestants as to Catholics, and the priests, with the Bishop at their head, are apparently still more so. They tell the natives that both forms are the same thing; that the object of both is to make men good and happy. They make no open efforts to convert: they visit, take interest in, and even advise, the native Protestant minister. And such is the surest means of attaining their end, if that end is the catholicising the native Protestants; and, of course, every Protestant will believe that it is. But to judge from the little I saw, and much that I heard, of Bishop Janssens and his vicar, I think they are both good and liberal men, and am sure they are clever ones, if only in this, that they do not make half-civilised men the bewildered arbiters of dogmas which, after all, are totally unnecessary to the practice of pure Christianity" (p. 353).

Mr. Tilley afterwards tells how he met the Bishop and his vicar, who invited him to their house. As he could not return with them, they recommended him to pass the night at Papoari; and the Bishop wrote a few lines in pencil to the native minister of that place, which, he said, would ensure him unbounded attention. "It's all the same that he's a Protestant," broke in Père Collette; "it's the same thing here, you know, Catholic or Protestant."

Whether this peculiar treatment of the Protestants of Tahiti is the result of the attitude of the French government and its discouragement of proselytism,—for the so-called Catholic government of France is, in Algeria and its colonies, far more anti-Catholic than that of England; or whether it proceeds from an opinion that by a little delay and patience the whole body of inhabitants can be gradually brought round, while the commotions resulting from the personal controversies that would arise if there were to be any attempt made to procure individual conversions, might frustrate the general conversion of the population; or whether it is judged safer to leave these semi-savages in their invincible ignorance of the few doctrines necessary to complete the circle of their Christianity, rather than to risk their acceptance of things which the English missionaries taught them to dread, or from whatever motive the policy of Bishop Janssens may arise,—the fact is worth observing for the sake of the principles which it involves.

Current Events.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Italian Revolution.

WE resume our calendar of the progress of the Italian Revolution, interrupted since May last. In the beginning of that month, Cardinal Wiseman, in describing the situation of the Pope, then recovering from an attack of illness, lamented that his tranquillity and happiness had become the sport of those whose duty it was to secure them at any sacrifice; that it was a matter of daily and fluctuating rumour whether or no he was to be handed over from one calling himself his son to another boasting of the same title, who were only haggling about the terms of the transfer. "The more gross injustices may have been accomplished; . . . the more personal insults may have been exhausted; . . . the act of spoliation may have been completed; he is now left hanging in what is intended to be ignominious suspense, whilst the dice are cast by political gamblers for his seamless robe of state, which two conjointly may never wear,—for that capital of the Christian world, the seat of his eternal pontificate,—to see whose it shall be,—a secular possession of one or many declared foes, no longer the object of the world's veneration." And the Cardinal suggested that no compromise is possible; that if the King of Italy enters Rome, the Pope must leave.

In May, Turin was agitated with the last scenes in the life of Cavour; the debates on the loan of 20,000,000*l.*, to patch up for the time the finances of the kingdom, which had been yearly sinking into worse confusion; the hopeless attempts to introduce order into the newly-acquired southern provinces, by means of a constitution dictated by haste and uncertainty, not to say by confusion, despondency, and disorder; the quarrel of Cavour and Garibaldi; the characteristic part taken by Cialdini in defence of the regular army,

and against the irregularity of Garibaldi's position and conduct both in the field and in the senate, followed by the apparent reconciliation of the three parties; the feast of the inauguration of the Italian kingdom; and the death of Cavour. At the same time, the relations between Rome and the Italian government were illustrated by the suppression of convents, and the confiscation of their property, in the Marches and Umbria, and the decree to put up the landed property for sale; against which a protest was made by Cardinal Antonelli to the diplomatic body at Rome, pointing out the "absolute nullity of the title" offered by the intruding government, and cautioning every one, Italians and foreigners, "from the illegal acquisition of property arising from the said spoliation." He also protested against the loan, because it would affect those provinces which the Pope still claimed.

Another quarrel arose from the wording of the decree which determined the administrative powers of the king's lieutenants in Naples and Sicily, whereby the "nomination and revocation" of Archbishops and Bishops was reserved to the king. It was, however, explained, that the Bishops were comprised in a long list of functionaries, some movable, others perpetual; and that the right of royal revocation only applied to those who were movable, not to those who had tenure for life, as magistrates and judges. The clergy and the new kingdom of Italy were also brought into conflict, upon the orders issued by Cavour for the religious observance of the Feast of the Unity of Italy, which was to take place on Sunday, June 2d. At Milan, the Chapter formally protested against the inhibition of Mgr. Caccia, the administrator, and announced their intention to take part in the ceremony in spite of him. Other scenes like this occurred, which Passaglia afterwards generalised into

a description which we shall quote below.

At this time also it was said that a French proposal for the solution of the Roman question had been rejected at Turin. The patrimony of St. Peter was to be guaranteed to the Pope, and guarded by Pontifical troops; the Italian troops not approaching within five miles of the city. The Romans to be Italian citizens, but only to exercise their political rights out of Rome. The French still to occupy Civita Vecchia for a time. This abortive proposal, which in Rome was believed to have been accepted at Turin, is worth recording in connexion with an analogous plan ventilated by Mgr. Liverani. At the time it was said to be backed by England, and only rejected by Cavour because he would not sacrifice his own popularity and influence in Italy, by giving up his great point of securing Rome for the capital.

When Cavour promised the Italians the possession of Rome within six months, it may be suspected that his object was rather to amuse the Republicans than to hold out any rational hope that his prediction could be accomplished. Throughout his career he had opposed Mazzini's end only by using his means, had made him powerless by making him superfluous, and had forced him to be inactive by doing his work for him. He had only protected Italy against the forms of Republicanism by providing free scope for Republican passions. And the cry "to Rome" was adopted by him from that party simply in accordance with the whole policy of his career; and he died just at the moment when it seemed that no other hand but his could guide the wild forces that he had let loose, and left his policy as a legacy to his successor, Ricasoli, who, probably with no more faith than Cavour in his ability to persuade the Emperor Napoleon to relinquish Rome, was yet obliged to echo the deceased statesman's declarations, and thus to adjourn the organisation of the incoherent masses of the kingdom, so hastily patched up, to an unknown period. It was proclaimed that the southern provinces never could be really united, or even pacified, till Rome

was the capital; and statesmen pretended to suppose that the mere sentiment of being governed from Rome rather than from Turin would at once allay all the passionate reaction, all the more or less profitable brigandage, that filled five of the southern provinces with rapine and slaughter. Still worse, they made this supposition the excuse for not taking measures that might have alleviated the difficulties of the situation. For if the position of Turin, so far to the north, was the parent of so much evil, surely matters might have been improved by the transfer of the government to Florence, a place in all respects but those of mere sentiment superior to Rome as the seat of a legislature and the centre of administration. The cry that Italy could not organise itself while it was maimed by not having Venetia, and while Rome, its heart, did not belong to it, rested on an absurd analogy, absurdly carried out; but it served as an excuse to the government for further temporising with the democratic party, instead of at once taking in hand those salutary and vigorous measures which will be found necessary, at some time or other, if the monarchy is to be preserved.

In the middle of June, Napoleon III. recognised the Italian kingdom, and renewed diplomatic intercourse with Turin. The following is a summary of the French note to the Italian government. "The emperor, on the demand of Victor Emmanuel, has recognised him as King of Italy. But by this recognition he does not approve the past policy of the Cabinet of Turin, nor does he encourage enterprises of a nature to compromise the general peace of Europe. The emperor regards the principle of non-intervention as a rule, and declines the responsibility of any project of aggression. The French troops will continue to occupy Rome so long as the interests which brought France to Rome are not secured by guarantees." Ricasoli answered in his note: "Our wish is to restore Rome to Italy, without depriving the Church of any of its grandeur, or the Pope of his independence." In the Chamber of Deputies, June 25, the minister thanked the emperor for his choice of the

occasion of making this "solemn manifestation," at a moment when he could thereby render less painful to Italy the great misfortune that had overtaken her, but assured the deputies that gratitude to France would never demand the least sacrifice of their rights and their interests.

On July 24, Ricasoli spoke, again indignantly denying any project of ceding Sardinia to France, and adding, "The king's government sees a national territory to defend and to recover; it sees Rome and Venice. . . . The opportunity which time is preparing will open the way to Venice; meanwhile, let us think of Rome. We wish to go to Rome. Rome, politically separated from the rest of Italy, will continue to be the centre of intrigues and conspiracies, and a permanent menace to public order. For Italians, therefore, it is not only a right, but an inexorable necessity. But we do not wish to go to Rome aided by rash and inopportune insurrectionary movements, which might compromise the national work. We wish to go to Rome in accord with France, not destroying, but building up, and at the same time opening to the Church a way of reform by giving her that liberty and independence which will invite her to regeneration,—a task to be accomplished by the purity of religious sentiment and simplicity of manners, by severity of discipline, and by the frank and loyal abandonment of that power which is opposed to the great idea of her institution."

On the other hand, at Rome, on St. Peter's-day, June 29th, after Mass, the Pope pronounced a new protest, and renewed all the declarations he made in the encyclical letter and allocutions of 1859 and 1860. About the same time he ordered, "not without great regret," the name of Mgr. Francesco Liverani to be struck from the list of the domestic prelates and apostolic notaries. This priest had been educated at the expense of the Pope, and owed every thing to his patronage; he had attracted attention by some valuable contributions to history from original documents, and he now surprised the world with a publication in answer to Montalembert's letter to Cavour, in which, though he

combats the views of the Turin Cabinet, yet he vies with M. About himself in the hostility of his tone to Cardinal Antonelli and the Roman court. Perhaps he adopted this line in order to recommend his book to the fervid youth of Italy, who, he says, are so maddened by the opposition of ecclesiastics to their political aspirations, that they are only prevented by foreign bayonets from murdering every priest in Rome. But the correctness of his details has been vehemently denied, and even his sanity impugned, in the *Civiltà Cattolica*. The scandalous part of his book, however, is only an introduction to those pages where he combats all the solutions of the Roman question which have been proposed by others, and offers a new one of his own, that seems to have been intended to recommend the French proposal rejected by Cavour, to which we have referred above.

The following is an outline of Liverani's view: The Papal States must be restored to the Pope; the King of Italy must not hold them either as his own or as a Papal fief. The latter solution, though in accordance with canonical precedents, would be an anachronism, and would soon result in final separation. Equally impossible is Massimo d'Azeglio's idea of making Rome a kind of Hanseatic town, or Levitical city of refuge, with an independent territory and senate; for when Rome was governed on this plan the Popes were in perpetual exile, and the restoration of that constitution would make Rome the refuge and hotbed of all the revolutionists of Europe. Prince Napoleon's plan (reverted to in a Parisian pamphlet of October 15th), to give the Pope the Vatican and the Trastevere, and to enthrone the King of Italy on the Capitol, is insane. It would shut up the Pope in a kind of *Ghetto*; the proximity of the rival powers would lead to all kinds of intrigue among the diplomatists at the Italian court; it would be impossible for the populations of the two sides of the river, one enjoying liberal institutions, the other ruled by the Index and Holy Office, either to mix, or to be separated, without a stringent system of passports and guard-houses in the middle of each bridge. As to the maintenance of the Papal court, the

plan which would secure the Pope annuities from the consolidated fund of each Catholic state would reduce him to the condition of a Torlonia or a Rothschild; not to mention the danger that each court would suspend payment every time the Pope was unable to comply with its "legitimate" demands. As to the Pope's continuing to reside in Rome,—to send him to Jerusalem with the title of king *in partibus* is mere drivelling; there is no necessity for his departure from Rome, because there is no need for the King of Italy to make Rome his capital. Rome is no fit centre for a constitutional government; its ecclesiastical character, its traditions, the fact that since Constantine no Cæsar could ever reside there in face of the Pope, the unhealthiness of its site, the character of its buildings, and the nature of the population, all forbid its being made the headquarters of the liberal government of a great constitutional kingdom. The Pope, then, must remain in Rome, and be governor of the States of the Church, though these states, as by the Constitution of Charlemagne, must be in temporal subjection and allegiance to the King of Italy, the legitimate representative of King Berengarius, and of the short-lived imperial dynasty of the Italians. Victor Emmanuel should be elected Emperor of the Romans; when, by the very terms of the canon law, the people of the Roman States would owe allegiance to him, and then, like the Cæsars of old, the new Emperor should abandon Rome to the Pope, and fix his capital elsewhere.

It will be seen that this plan is precisely that attributed to the Emperor Napoleon, with the addition of the proposition of making the Italian crown imperial. The book abounds with panegyrics of the Napoleonic policy, and is written in the French interest, probably with a view of backing up the French proposal, though the author has been wrongly confounded with the Piedmontese party.

In the middle of July, the state of the Neapolitan provinces led Ricasoli to appoint General Cialdini king's lieutenant in Naples, with full civil and military powers. The severe measures he was obliged to take, and the small success that attended them

drew from Massimo d'Azeglio a remarkable letter, of which the following are the principal passages. "2d August 1861. . . . The question of holding or not holding Naples depends, I suppose, mainly on the Neapolitans, unless we wish to change at our convenience the principles which we have hitherto preached. We advanced with the profession that governments not enjoying the consent of the people were illegitimate; and with this maxim we caused some Italian princes to decamp. Their subjects made no protest, and so expressed their consent to our work; . . . so far our acts were in accord with our principles. At Naples, likewise, we drove out the king, to set up a government founded on universal consent; but we want sixty regiments and more to keep the kingdom in order; and it is notorious that, brigands or no brigands, no one will recognise it.

"But, you will say, there is universal suffrage. I know nothing of suffrage; but I know, that while on this side the Tronto we want no regiments, they are wanted on the other side. There was, then, some mistake; and we must change our dealings or our principles. We must ask the Neapolitans once again, and for good, whether they want us or not. I comprehend that Italians had a right to fight those who wished to keep the Austrians in Italy; but for Italians who, remaining Italians, do not wish to unite with us, I think we have no right to shoot them; except, for brevity, we adopt the principle on which Bomba bombarded Palermo, Messina, &c."

This defection from the cause of Italian unity, and the very natural solidarity of the Roman government with the partisans of Francis II. against their common enemy, called forth a circular from Ricasoli to the foreign agents of his government, dated August 24th. We give an outline of his circular, partly in his own words, partly in brief.

"No new circumstances," he says, "have arisen to diminish the confidence of the government in the patriotism of the southern provinces; but as the brigandage is now redoubling its efforts, and as the coöperation of its auxiliaries has increased, and as acts of unheard-of cruelty have provoked

corresponding repression, these facts have been used as the ground of a stronger protest against the Piedmontese oppression of an unfortunate country, 'forced by trick and violence from its legitimate master, to whom it desires to return, even at the cost of martyrdom.' Moreover, honourable men, strongly Italian by old affection and profound conviction, incline to the belief that the union was made inconsiderately, and should be put to the proof of a fresh experiment. Ricasoli, however, declares it impossible even to doubt the legitimacy or the efficacy of the *plebiscite*; henceforth no united province can ever declare itself separated from the rest. 'The Italian nation is constituted, and all that is Italy belongs to it.'

After this preface, Ricasoli proceeds to explain the state of the case in the Neapolitan provinces.

"Wherever the form of government and the dynasty have had to be changed by a revolution, there always remain, to trouble the new order of things, for a period more or less long, a leaven of the past, which cannot be got rid of without fratricidal conflicts." He instances Spain, England with the Jacobites, and France with the Girondists and Vendéans; and yet the acts of repression of the Spanish, English, and French governments were ever considered justifiable, and the armed resistance has been called rebellion, though it had regular armies, experienced generals, territories and fortresses, and had to be put down by a regular war and by pitched battles; but in the Neapolitan rebellions all these conditions are wanting, for the movement, for the most part, is not political at all; and the baron quotes the English consul Severn, who reports to his government: "The bands of malefactors are not so numerous as they seem; but they go about every where; . . . rob travellers and pillage hamlets. . . . The old Bourbon flag has been raised in some places, but it is certain that the movement has no political character, and that it is a system of agrarian Vandalism (?), embraced as a profession by a great part of the disbanded troops, who prefer pillage to labour." Yet such soldiers and freebooters may be an instrument in the hands of the reaction; but it would be an error to

regard it as an armed protest of the country against a new order of things, or to suppose it as important as it has been said to be.

"Of the fifteen provinces which composed the kingdom of Naples, five only are infested with brigands. Not that they occupy these provinces, or are established in any town or village; but they live in small bands on the mountains, and descend upon defenceless places for booty. They never dare attack even a third-rate town, or a position guarded by troops, however few; but where they enter they open the prisons, and, with the help of the criminals and the marauding peasantry, they rob and pillage, and then take to flight.

"Brigandage, as thus practised in the Neapolitan provinces, is not a political reaction, but a natural fruit of the wars, the frequent political commotions, and the rapid changes of bad governments, which have desolated those provinces; it prevailed under the Spanish and Austrian viceroyalties up to 1734, under the Bourbons, under Joseph Bonaparte, and Murat. It is therefore accounted for by historical precedents and the habits of the country, to which we must add the excitement of political revolution, and other special causes, namely, the bad government of the Bourbons, denounced by the Congress of Paris as barbarous and savage, and called by Mr. Gladstone the negation of God. The principle of the Bourbon government was the corruption of every thing and every body—a corruption so universally and persistently carried out, that every thing which in tolerably organised governments serves to strengthen, to discipline, and to moralise, there only served to weaken and deprave. 'The police was a privilege accorded to an association of malefactors to harass and plunder the people as they pleased, and to exercise espionage for the government. Such was the Camorra. The army, with certain exceptions, was composed of elements carefully selected, scrupulously trained by the Jesuits and chaplains in the most abject and servile idolatry of the king, and in the blindest superstition. It had no idea of duty towards the country; its only duty was to defend the king against the citi-

zens, considered as essentially enemies, and in a continuous state of rebellion, at least in intention.' Rebellion was the gain of the army, because it then had free range for its covetousness and passions, — moreover there was nothing to maintain discipline, or to produce an *esprit de corps*; the soldier had no love for his country: he was only required to be submissive to the king, who flattered him. There were 100 000 of them, well armed, paid, and placed; and yet they did not fight, but continually retreated before a handful of irregulars; regiments, even a complete division, submitted to be taken prisoners. It was thought that such men would never make good soldiers, so they were disbanded; but, accustomed to a life of idleness and dissipation in barracks, and unused to labour, they became brigands. If they sometimes displayed the Bourbon flag, it was from habit, not affection. As they had dishonoured themselves by not defending their flag, so now they dishonoured their flag by making it the emblem of murder and pillage."

After thus tracing the formation of the brigandage, Ricasoli relates how it came to be a political instrument.

"The dispossessed King of Naples resides at Rome in the Quirinal, and he there coins the false money with which the Neapolitan brigands are freely supplied. The offerings extorted from the Catholics throughout the different countries in Europe, in the name of Peter's Pence, are employed to enrol these brigands in every part of Europe. They go to Rome to inscribe their names publicly, to receive the word of order, and the blessing[*of the Pope*]. From Rome they obtain the immense quantities of arms and ammunition which they require.

"On the Roman and Neapolitan frontiers there are depôts and places of rendezvous and refuge, . . . as is proved beyond doubt by the late perquisitions of the French. The hostile attitude and language of part of the clergy, the arms and proclamations found in convents, the priests and monks taken in the ranks of the brigands, prove beyond all doubt whence and in whose name all these instigations proceed. And as there are here no religious interests to defend (and

even if there were, their defence by such means could not be tolerated), it is evident that the connivance and complicity of the Roman court with the Neapolitan brigandage are founded on the solidarity of temporal interests, and that the object now is to keep the southern provinces in a state of revolt, and to prevent the establishment of a regular government, in order that the sovereignty of the Pope may not be deprived of its last support in Italy."

Hence Ricasoli trusts that all will see that the temporal power is condemned, not only by the irresistible logic of the national unity, but also by its proved incompatibility with civilisation and humanity.

"But," the baron proceeds, "even granting the movement to be essentially political, no argument can be drawn from it. Its duration is nothing, because from the nature of the country, close to the Roman frontier, it is impossible to surround the bands. And that it is not upheld by half the population, is proved by the fact that there have been no insurrections to join them, that they have no party in the press, and that the National Guard and volunteers are all against them. 'At the present moment, differences of opinion are disappearing; the various sections of the liberal party rally round the government, so that neither the regular nor the local forces have experienced a single defeat. For more than a year, in the midst of so much uncertainty, anxiety, and change, in the exercise of a new and unrestricted liberty, Naples, that great city of 500 000 inhabitants, has not raised a single cry of disunion, has not permitted the realisation of a single one of the thousand Bourbonist conspiracies which are continually springing up, to disappear immediately.'

"Hence it is clear, that the Neapolitan brigandage has no political character; that the European reaction, established and countenanced at Rome, fomented and supports it in the name of the dynastic interests of divine right, and in the name of the temporal power of the Pope, taking an abusive advantage of the French arms placed there to guarantee more elevated and more spiritual interests; that the Neapolitan populations are

not hostile to national unity, nor unworthy of liberty, as some persons would have it believed.

"The civilisation of the present age cannot tolerate that schemes of subjugation should be prepared at the seat and centre of Catholicity, not only with the connivance, but with the countenance of the ministers of the Pope. Religious men are indignant at the abuse of sacred things for ends altogether temporal. Rome is compromising her religious without promoting her worldly interests. The conviction of this, already attained by every upright mind, will facilitate the task of the Italian government, which is that of restoring to Italy and to the Church her liberty and dignity."

On the very day when this circular of Ricasoli's was made known to the public, a pamphlet appeared at Paris, called *L'Empereur, Rome, et le Roi d'Italie*, which, in spite of official disavowals, has been supposed to contain the view of the imperial government. It declares that the policy of the reaction is to make the Neapolitan provinces another Vendée, and Rome another Coblenz; and that the movement is less a civil war than a brigandage on a large scale, excited and paid from Rome by the ex-king of Naples with the gold of Legitimists and priests, as the Count of Artois formerly paid the Chouans from London with English gold. This is the theme of the first chapter. The second maintains that a united Italy, instead of being an object of fear for France, accords with French interests, and that the union is incomplete without Rome; that the Italian nation has a right to its capital, and that the capital of Italy is Rome. Chapter iii. is a savage attack upon the government of Rome for treating men, like cattle, as property; and for adding "against Italy," land and inhabitants, "the principle of expropriation for religious utility." It argues that civilisation requires the separation of temporal and spiritual power; that the Pope may be as independent without a kingdom, as the French Bishops and priests without their old domains; that his temporal power has been lessened, therefore it may be annihilated; that it is of human origin, therefore not eternal; that the French

occupation was intended to conciliate religion and nationality; that the nation has made every advance, while the guardians of religion have refused all concession; that all Italy is now attracted to Victor Emmanuel, and the Romans have been drawn within the magic circle; and that Europe, which was so alarmed at the triumvirate of 1848, will be content to leave Rome in the hands of the constitutional king. Chapter v. says that the Italian government has offered every guarantee, material and moral, to secure the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff, and recommends the Pope to submit.

About a month afterwards a supplementary pamphlet was published, with the title, *Guarantees given by the King of Italy for the Independence of the Holy See*. The conclusion was, to abolish the temporal power; to intrust the personal security of the Pope to the filial loyalty of the King of Italy, and to place the independence of the Holy See under the guarantee of the powers. The person of the Pope to be inviolable and sacred, as also those of the Cardinals. The Papal States to be united to the kingdom of Italy. Rome to be the capital of Italy, and to remain the seat of the Sovereign Pontiff. His Holiness to retain all the honours he has hitherto enjoyed; to have accredited ambassadors and ministers, enjoying the same immunities and privileges as the members of the diplomatic body; to keep his propaganda, his penitentiary, and his archives; his palaces and goods to be exempt from all taxes, jurisdictions, or domiciliary visits. According to this plan, the church and piazza of St. Peter, and the palace of the Vatican, with its dependencies, would be secured to the Pope and his successors. He would receive, instead of tithes from the public revenues of his old states, so much a year from the consolidated fund of the Italian kingdom, while each Catholic power would be invited to guarantee him a proportional income, under the title of Peter's Pence. He would be entreated to create Cardinals of different nationalities, in proportion to the numbers of Catholics in each nation, which would provide for its own Cardinals, and for its proportion of the Pope's guard of

honour, to be chosen by his legates from each state. These guards alone, during vacancies of the Holy See, would be allowed to approach the palace of the conclave. The King of Italy would engage solemnly before God, kings, and people to protect the person of the Pope, to take care that the independence of the Holy See remains entire, and that the prescriptions necessary for this independence be maintained. He would make known his resolve to give the Church in Italy a greater liberty than it enjoys in any other country of the globe,—this liberty to include the direct nomination of Bishops by the ecclesiastical authority, without the intervention of the state; the right of assembling synods and councils; free correspondence with the Pope, and a complete latitude for the publication of pastorals and of bulls. This spontaneous concession of the Italian government, it is argued, would probably lead to similar measures in other countries, especially after the Papal sovereignty had become once more simply spiritual.

It is clear, continues the pamphlet, by what is going on in France, that the nomination of Bishops by the government does not produce the results expected, but rather compromises the government; and that the public councils of 1850 produced fewer evils than the private meetings of the present day. It maintains that there is no danger in free communication with the Pope, as Belgium proves; that these antiquated precautions are impossible with our ports and railroads, and are therefore both vain and odious; that the liberty of the press makes the civil authorisation of the introduction of bulls illusory; and that as for pastorals, public opinion and the common law give better guarantees than the old appeal to the Council of State. The old precautions, it says, were chiefly measures of reprisal against a Church which interfered in matters of state; in the new order they will be no longer needed.

Similarly, we are told, the King of Italy will grant perfect liberty of education and of religious associations; because he has full confidence in the good sense of the people, and in their patriotism, and a people come to maturity has no longer need of all those

legal protections which were necessary to secure the liberty of individuals in the infancy of society. Such was the pamphlet.

It is certain, in spite of the criticisms upon Ricasoli's circular that appeared in the semi-official press of Paris, and in spite of the official disavowals of these two pamphlets, that the French Emperor has quite changed his mind since May, when he seems to have considered a mitigated temporal sovereignty to be still possible, and has come to the conclusion that the whole system must be entirely wiped out, and the Pope entirely deprived of all temporal sovereignty, and of all civil power. And as the scheme of May found a clerical advocate in Liverani, so that of August found a pleader (actor) in Passaglia.

But before we pass on to Passaglia's pamphlet, we must notice the protests and contradictions that Ricasoli's circular called forth.

The official journal of Rome abstained from describing the document, on the ground that it had been already judged by all good men in Europe. It confined itself to declaring that the assertions of the Piedmontese minister concerning the attitude of the Holy See, which Piedmont had iniquitously and unjustly robbed, were a tissue of calumnies. "It would be unworthy to pause an instant to demonstrate the falsity of the assertions made with singular imprudence in the document in question;" and an appeal was made to the ambassadors and consuls at Rome, and to the French army of occupation, to bear witness to the falsehood of Ricasoli's insinuations. A few days afterwards, a semi-official French journal was authorised to declare that all the powers without exception had acknowledged the truth of the Roman government's statements in protest against Ricasoli. Another Roman paper had the unhappy thought of publishing a forged protest of the exiled nobility of Naples against the same circular; but it was obliged soon to confess its error. The Turin papers replied to the contradiction by publishing what purported to be a diploma and instructions, proving the existence and explaining the organisation of a permanent Bourbon conspiracy at Rome. But we have no

means in this case of judging between spurious and genuine documents. A protest was also published in the name of Francis II.; but as we have not seen it, we can give no extracts.

Controversies do not go for much unless it can be ascertained that the parties affirming and denying are really discussing the same points, and are using words in the same sense. The Roman government might well resent and contradict a document that reproached the Pope as being the head of a band of brigands, and yet it might be true that his government was encouraging a legitimate reaction against an intruding usurper, supplying arms to the recruits of the royalist army, and identifying his interests with those of his ally. Ricasoli, when he wrote the circular, held in his hands documentary evidence of the solidarity of the Roman government with the Neapolitan reaction in the interests of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope; this fact is authentic, though of course the opposite parties will call it by different names, and estimate it differently.

As Liverani was the clerical advocate of the propositions of May,—propositions distasteful in themselves to the union party, and clumsily recommended to them by an attack on the Roman administration which, if true, proved it to be as unfit for the modified sovereignty which he proposed as it was for the absolute government it claimed,—so the thorough-going conclusions of August found a more able defender and pleader in the Abbate Passaglia, the great Roman theologian, to whom the process of the Immaculate Conception was committed. His pamphlet, *Plea of a Catholic Priest for the Italian Cause, addressed to the Catholic Episcopate*, begins with a preface, the topics of which are significant enough. Though men, he says, who seek truth, and not triumph, attend rather to the arguments brought forward than to the man who brings them, yet men in general depend rather on authority than on reason, and accept persons rather than science. In deference to this feeling, the author brings forward his own claims to be heard. First, he is a real and sincere Catholic, attached with all his heart to the Christian creed in its integrity, and to the hierarchy and discipline of

the Church; yet, besides the hierarchy of sacred orders, he begs his readers to consider that they also are a royal priesthood, different indeed from the hierarchical priesthood, but a constituent part of the Church (so that, as Tertullian says, *ubique tres, ecclesia est, licet laici*), and a part which has often taken an important share in religious controversies. But the writer is more than a layman—he is a priest; and he quotes the well-known passages from St. Jerome, and refers to eight other Fathers, in proof of a certain coördination and equality between priests and bishops in all matters but the laying-on of hands. Not but that the Bishops are the apostolic order, the overseers of the flock, the summit of the priesthood; still priests have a right, with becoming modesty, to give their opinion in times of struggle, in order to smooth down difficulties, and to reconcile dissensions.

Such are the topics of the preface, and it is not difficult to see what application the author intends them to have, when, as he says, nearly all the laity, and, as he implies, a party among the priests, stand aloof from the Episcopate in the course which they are pursuing. The preface has the air of a humble apology for a poor and unworthy priest who dares to speak on one side while all his superiors take the other; but there occasionally crops out a consciousness of an overwhelming material force to back up his plea.

Then comes the following argument. The unity of the Catholic faith, in the confession of one God, one Christ, and one Church, is consistent with a certain plurality, distinction, and variety on all these points: in the one God are three Persons; in the one Christ two Natures; in the one Church many members, on whose multiplicity and variety in their unity he adduces testimonies of the Fathers. But the adversary has attacked this unity on all points: the unity of God and of Christ by the early heresies, the unity of the Church chiefly by the schism of the sixteenth century; yet this unity shall never be destroyed,—the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. But single churches may suffer shipwreck; and the present aspect of the Italian Church is sufficient to rack a man's heart. "For who so blind as not to

see that Italy is in so miserable a plight that the majority of her children are in the greatest proximate danger of falling from the Church either openly and bodily, or by a hidden and spiritual separation, and Mother Church herself in danger of losing her choicest sons? A great part of the clergy dissents from the majority of the laity; almost all the pastors are separated from their flocks; and the Pastor of pastors, the successor of St. Peter, the visible Vicar of Christ upon earth, fulminates excommunication and censures against the kingdom and people of Italy. You would think that the power of binding alone was left to the Bishops, so entirely are they occupied in blaming, rejecting, execrating what Italians, great and small, what the whole nation most ardently desires and most gladly embraces. And what is this? Have the Italians, like the English, Germans, Swedes, Danes, and many French, fallen from the orthodox creed? No, they firmly believe all its articles. Do they refuse obedience to their legitimate prelates in matters of religion? No, they are united in rendering to them the obedience commanded by God. Do they despise the supreme spiritual authority of the Roman Bishop and Supreme Pontiff? No, they reverence it. Do they madly attack, or cunningly undermine, the liberty which Christ purchased for the Church by His blood? No, they proclaim 'a free church in a free state;' they anxiously try all ways of healing the quarrel; after two or three repulses, they again ask for peace, and are unanimous in declaring that they will prove by their actions that they have no dearer wish than that the Church may enjoy perfect immunity and liberty." What is to be done, then, but humbly to implore Pope, Bishops, and clergy to remember St. Augustine's rule, "never proudly to exult over their erring children, nor to be hard in pardoning after rebuking." For, he proceeds, Bishops were divinely instituted in the Church as pastors for the common profit of their flocks; and their work is limited to religious usefulness and spiritual help, by preaching, by the sacraments, and by discipline. Hence St. Augustine recommends them, when they cannot be thus profitable, rather to resign

their sees than be the cause of troubling the peace of the Church. For the object of the institution of Bishops is to preserve the peace of Christ, and the concord of Christians. "But how do our Italian fathers in Christ, our pastors and masters, behave? The thing is too evident to admit of exaggeration. The population of Italy is overflowing with joy, but the Bishops with querulous voice and sorrowful speech are lamenting their loss. It is earnestly thanking God for the good things He has given, but the Bishops are judiciously warning it to appease God's wrath for the national sin. It flocks in crowds to the churches, but the Bishops drive away the congregations, and forbid them to enter the holy places. It wishes to offer to God the sacrifice of the altar, but the Bishops threaten to suspend the priests if they celebrate. In a word, there is nothing which the population most earnestly desires which the Bishops do not most earnestly pray to be delivered from. And what is this but to make their function a scandal to their flocks? to profess that Bishops are set in the Church for themselves, not for the people to whom they minister? What but to tear the members of Christ, instead of securing the peace of Christ? What but, in St. Augustine's words, 'to stint the Lord's gains for their own temporal dignity?' Christ's law is, that Bishops had better not be at all than be injurious to the peace of Christ, than help to scatter His flock, and to provoke a schism." The end of the existence of Bishops is the unity of the Church, as opposed to schism and division; and they are the types as well as the instruments of this unity. The Bishop of each church is the symbol and instrument of the unity of that church; the Pope, of the unity of the whole Church, that in him its unity might be both manifested and constituted. The writer spends many pages in proving this from the Fathers, and then applies his doctrine. "Wherefore the institution of Bishops in general, and of the Pope in particular, was and ever will be for this end, to preserve the unity, whether of particular churches or of the whole Church, and to insure her triumph over heresies and schisms. Unity was, is, and will be the end to which the hierarchy and its various

grades are directed by God. Those who endanger this unity damage it, or destroy it, are guilty of the greatest of crimes, and are enemies of the most merciful counsel of Christ. But now, do the majority of Italian Bishops nourish, protect, and defend unity, or do they agitate it, disturb it, ruin it, when they drive away their flocks, curse them, and separate themselves from the triumphant and thankful congregations as if they were heathens and publicans? . . . Unless concord very soon takes the place of discord, peace of war, and unity of division, the noble Italian Church seems more than in danger—upon the point of utter ruin.” Without the Bishop there is no Church; the Church is defined to be, “the people united with the priest, the flock adhering to its pastor.” So, if there is no Church where there is no pastor, there is also no Church where there is no people, no united flock. But what is the appearance of Christian congregations in several parts of Italy? Certainly not people united with their pastors; and what will happen if the division grows wider daily,—if the pastors every day depart farther from their flocks? The Italian churches are only relics, shadows, outlines of what they were, and they will gradually vanish away unless the prelates soon find out the way of peace, unless they remember what makes the difference between the shepherd and the hireling. And here he applies some very strong texts of Scripture to those against whom he is arguing, and hopes that they will profit by them.

He next proceeds to discuss objections to his argument. It will be answered, he says, it is absurd to suppose that the Pope and Bishops will ever come to terms with the Italians, approve their cause, and accept the new order of things. They have succeeded in checking the movement, if they have not put a stop to it; and what is to be feared? The Church may be oppressed, but never extinguished, if she suffers without consenting to the evil; in fact, schisms and divisions only serve to prove her and cleanse her, by casting out bad men. Yes; but in times of great agitation the bad are not cast out without many good being among them, as St. Augustine says: and then the unjust

excommunication only hurts the person who excommunicates. Hence it is never safe to excommunicate wholesale: “correction is never salutary, except when the man corrected has few followers.” This is the rule which St. Augustine deduces from St. Paul, and which the Church has adopted in the canon law. “But have the Italian Bishops or the Pope observed this rule? Had those whom they excommunicated no multitude of followers? Or were they few, and did almost all their countrymen disagree with them? Were they without powerful defenders, who might easily bring about a schism? Let the Bishops look whether the people take the side of the prelate who censures, or of the accused person who resists. Let them examine the state of men’s minds, and see whether their excommunication corrects them or hardens them, cures them or slays them.”

But to examine the reasons alleged why the Bishops cannot accept Italian unity. They are two: (1) justice, and (2) the independence of the Pope. But is it perfectly certain that Italian unity cannot be accepted without *iniquity* by the Bishops, or by the Pope without *sacrilege and surrender of independence*?

First, St. Bernard declared that earthly causes of this kind, and the international quarrels of princes, are not those which Bishops have to decide; they must be left to the kings and princes of the earth. The authority of Bishops is in a higher sphere, namely, the interior court of conscience. They have no right to sit in the external court, and judge who is to possess the earth, but only to exclude sinners from heaven.

But I wish, says the author, that the Bishops would really examine the cause between the kingdom of Italy and the dispossessed princes,—they would then see that the charge of *injustice* is not so self-evident. The charge may be made without being proved. Or, if proved, it may only be made out with a degree of probability insufficient to justify opposition to the Italian kingdom, which is now *ipso facto* in possession. Unless clearly and evidently proved, no action can be taken upon it.

Now, is it so clear? Examine it either by the external rule of the

consent of well-informed men, or by the intrinsic rule of principles, and in either case the proof is incomplete.

For neither are well-informed men agreed upon the point; there is at least as much authority in favour of as against the kingdom of Italy; it may claim the benefit of the doubt. Nor is the argument from principles more conclusive against it. We have to consider what is the source of political power; whether the people may not, when it is necessary or useful, alter or entirely change the form of government; whether they have any right to assert their own liberty and autonomy; whether this right is superior or inferior to the acquired rights of princes; whether princes are bound not to assert their rights when they are in contradiction to the good of the people, and hinder their autonomy and full independence; what is the force of a *plebiscite* in determining social questions; finally, what is the force to be attributed to "accomplished facts." Now, can the Italian cause be clearly proved to be unjust on these principles? is it not rather doubtful, and neither manifestly just nor manifestly unjust? Nay, judged by these principles, is it not rather more just than otherwise?

Now, if the cause were clearly unjust, then *perhaps* the Pope and Bishops would be right in trying to overthrow it. But when the Italian kingdom exists *de facto*, and *de jure* is as likely to be just as otherwise, it can only be party-spirit and irritation, not justice, that makes the Bishops oppose it.

But granting, for argument's sake, that the Italian kingdom was vitiated in its source, yet the writer affirms that it exists *de facto*, if not *de jure*, from the Alps to Sicily. Now the constant rule of the Church in such cases, as laid down by Clement V., John XXII., Pius II., Sixtus IV., Clement XI., and Gregory XVI., is textually as follows: "The good of the Church, the salvation of souls, and the functions imposed by God upon pastors, requires that political contests should be let be, that controversies of human and civil law should be left to those whom they concern, and that the peace of the Church should be offered to kingdoms which exist *de facto*, and which are in possession, and that

nothing whereby Christian communion is enhanced should be refused to them."

But is this rule observed by the Bishops, and, much more, by the Pope? Does Pius IX. act as did St. Ambrose with Maximus, or St. Augustine with the Count Boniface, or St. Gregory the Great with the Emperor Phocas, the greatest traitor and monster that ever usurped a crown, but who was accepted by the Pope as the emperor *de facto*, and treated with all the respect due to Cæsar? If the clergy were to follow these examples, it would not be branded as Bourbon or Austrian, but it would be called simply Catholic, and regain its old popularity, by following St. Augustine's recommendation, "not to be so proud of its orders as to think it need not obey the temporal powers." Then there would be no more dissensions between Church and State, or between pastors and flocks; then the weak in faith would not be repelled from the Church and her ministrations; then we should not be asked, how it is that while the Bishops of Poland and Hungary sympathise with the wishes of their nation, our Bishops anathematise our wishes; or why our Bishops reject a *plebiscite* while the French Bishops accept it. Then follow more quotations, implying charges of temporal ambition, covetousness, pride, and want of charity against the Italian Bishops.

But since the Bishops must always adhere to the Chief Pastor, they will unite their voices with that of the Pope, and will never change till he lays aside his hostility to the Italian kingdom, and grants it peace. Now, will he do so? There are three great difficulties in his way.

The first is, "after the Pope's frequent and solemn declarations, he cannot approve what has been done, or bless the kingdom of Italy." But his declarations were not dogmatic; they were judgments on passing circumstances, and they ought to change as circumstances change. Now the circumstances of Italy are such that it is his duty, in order to preserve society, to reconsider his declarations. Obstinacy is not constancy; it is base to change a good resolution, glorious to change a foolish one.

But secondly, the Pope's oath,

whereby he has bound himself to preserve intact the patrimony of St. Peter, is the grand obstacle to any such change. Yet the oath was introduced by Pius V., and confirmed by Urban VII., with the single object of preventing portions of the states being granted to Popes' nephews, according to the custom at one time prevailing; so it does not apply in this case. Besides, no oath binds a man to do what is impossible; and if the precise terms of an oath become in time incompatible with facts, they may well be altered. The oath, then, should be considered in the following lights. Is it any longer morally or physically in the Pope's power to keep it? Is it for the benefit of the Holy See to refuse all change? Have circumstances so altered as to call for a change, when the Pope clearly cannot keep what he has, and when an equivalent or even better guarantee is offered? The writer answers all these questions like an Italian patriot. The better guarantee offered, and accepted by him in simple trust and confidence, is the famous "free church in a free state."

The third great difficulty is, that "the loss of civil sovereignty will lead to the loss of Papal sovereignty; and the loss of the political independence, given by God's special providence, will also endanger the spiritual independence of the Pope." And how can the Bishops be parties to advising the Pope to take such a course? But this necessity of temporal sovereignty for spiritual independence is completely a modern invention: for seven centuries, from Peter to Stephen, it was never heard of; and yet Silvester, Marcus, Clement, Cornelius, Damasus, Cœlestine, Leo, and the rest, were as independent as any of their successors, though not one of them had sovereignty, whether we take the word to mean royal power, or the majesty, glory, and honour that surround the chair of Peter. But neither of these comes from the institution of Christ, who gave simply a spiritual sovereignty and spiritual majesty, consisting in humility, and not in secular pomp. The sovereignty by itself is clearly contradictory to the spirit of the Gospel; its only possible defence is, that it is necessary to protect the independence of

the Holy See. This, says the writer, is the knot of the whole difficulty. Is political power necessary to secure the liberty of the Pope and of his ecclesiastical ministry?

Now, liberty means either (1) the right and full power of possessing or doing a thing, or else (2) a facility for possessing or doing a thing, hindered by none, or by the fewest possible obstacles. According to these two senses, the question resolves itself into, either, (1) is the liberty of a political sovereignty necessary or highly useful for preventing the Pope's right and full authority of binding and loosing, confirming his brethren, and feeding the flock of Christ, from perishing or being obscured? or, (2) is the political sovereignty necessary or highly expedient for the easy and free performance of this apostolic ministry?

Now, about the first question there is no difficulty; the Papal rights in the first sense of liberty are immutable, incapable of increase or decrease; and it is a point of Catholic faith firmly to hold and constantly to profess that the right and authority of the Supreme Pontiff has no dependence upon, no relations whatever with, his political sovereignty.

But with regard to ease and facility of performing his high functions, what freedom of action would be left to him if he were a subject? or how would he get over the suspicion of dependence, however free he was left? But has he complete freedom now? the question is not about absolute independence, but about the best guarantee. He has not perfect facility in performing all his functions now, and such facility is contrary to the predictions of Christ, to the nature of things, and the example of history. The Pope cannot be better off than the Church, and the Church militant is always to be like a ship tossed in a stormy sea. In fact, St. Augustine says, that the Church of Christ in all His saints was to serve (*servitutam*) under the kings of the world; and he calls it "sound doctrine, confirmed by the Lord's example," to hold that she must always pay tribute to them. The real source of Papal liberty is the same as that of all Christian liberty—God's making us new creatures. The good will is the true

liberty, and the Pope's best friends are those who exhort him, not to fight for an earthly sovereignty, but to imitate Christ most perfectly. The writer ends his argument with a well-known quotation from St. Bernard *de Consideratione*, where Pope Eugenius is told of the yoke of vile slavery that his temporal power imposes upon him, by loading him with worldly business, and robbing him of all opportunities of meditation and spiritual repose. "If ever," concludes the writer, "the state of human society appeared to require the union of a political sovereignty with the Pontificate, the aspect of things is now so changed, that nothing would seem more desirable for the Pope himself than the separation of the sceptre from the keys, of the tiara from the crown. This separation is demanded by the unwilling subjects of the Pope, who are kept down by foreign bayonets, and by the whole Italian people, who unanimously declare that they will no longer suffer the Italian kingdom to be without Rome for its capital. The most civilised nations of Europe agree that the civil sovereignty is the source of the greatest evils to the Papedom: these dangers can only be avoided by a change in the Pope's policy," &c.

This pamphlet has been put on the Roman Index; the author, having published it anonymously, was not allowed to defend it; and consequently we have not been told for what points it has been condemned.

The enthusiastic theologian has been carried away by his Italian patriotism to see what better politicians than he cannot see: he sees Italy one from the Alps to Sicily. Massimo d'Azeglio sees in this assumed unity only the result of a tyrannical appeal to force. Moreover, he sees in the mere promise of a government which has systematically oppressed and deceived the Bishops and clergy for the last twelve years a sufficient guarantee of the Papal freedom: such simplicity is rarely found but in the childish enthusiasm of a professor newly turned politician. And with this misplaced confidence in the good faith of the Italian government, he would fain persuade the Pope to stay in the Vatican while Victor Emmanuel is in the Capitol. For this purpose he has published, under the

name of Ernesto Filalete, another pamphlet, the argument of which is drawn from Holstenius, librarian to Pope Alexander VII., who ordered him to discuss the question, whether the Tridentine Canon, that obliged all Bishops to live in their dioceses *near their church*, obliged the Pope to live at the Vatican, or whether it was enough to live any where in Rome.

It may be patriotic, but it is clearly illogical, to apply the arguments of Holstenius to the present question; the Council of Trent orders the Bishops to reside in their sees in ordinary times, but makes no provision for such an extraordinary event as keeping the Pope, weak and unarmed, in Rome, while the city is occupied by a government able and willing to impose conditions upon him which he does not think compatible with the safety of the Church, or with his duty as Pope.

The chief reply that Passaglia's pamphlet called forth was an allocution of the Pope, from which we only omit the passages which refer to the expulsion of the Cardinal Archbishop from Naples, and to the state of Mexico and Granada, and the peroration.

"THE ALLOCUTION DELIVERED BY OUR HOLY FATHER, POPE PIUS IX., IN THE SECRET CONSISTORY OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1861.

"Every one knows how the satellites of the Piedmontese government, and rebellion, full of cunning and deceit, and become abominable in their ways, have renewed the crimes of the heretics of old, and endeavour completely to subvert, if possible, the Church of God and the Catholic religion, to rob souls of its teaching, and to inflame all evil passions.

"All laws, divine and human, have been trampled under foot; all ecclesiastical censures despised; Bishops, with an audacity which increases daily, expelled from their own dioceses, and even cast into prison; many of the faithful people deprived of their pastors; priests, both secular and regular, crushed by ill-usage and exposed to every sort of injustice; religious congregations destroyed, their members driven from their homes, and reduced to utter need. Virgins

consecrated to God have been obliged to beg their bread; the most venerated shrines have been plundered, profaned, and changed into dens of thieves; consecrated things pillaged, ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction violated and usurped; the laws of the Church despised and trampled under foot. Schools of evil doctrine have been established; libels and infamous journals, works of darkness, have been distributed in all places, at an immense expense, by a criminal conspiracy. These abominable writings attack our holy faith, religion, piety, decency, modesty, honour, and virtue, overturn the immutable rules of the eternal law, of the law of nature, of public and private right. Individual liberty and property are attacked, the foundations of the family and of civil society are ruined, the reputation of all virtuous people is blackened by false accusations, and violated by the grossest insults. Unbridled license, and impunity of all vices and errors, are daily more and more propagated.

"Every body sees what a deplorable host of calamities and crimes has been heaped upon unhappy Italy in consequence of this great rebellion; for, in the words of the Prophet Osee, 'Malediction, lying, murder, robbery, and adultery have flooded the world, and blood has been poured out upon blood.'

"Yes, our heart is filled with horror; words fail us to describe the towns in the kingdom of Naples burnt and destroyed, the number of virtuous priests and religious men, and citizens of every age, sex, and condition, not excepting even those pining under sickness, loaded with outrages, cast into prison, or put to death without so much as a trial.

"Who would not be filled with sadness to see these rebels, without any respect for the ministers of religion, for the dignity of Bishops or Cardinals, without any respect for us, for this Apostolic See, for churches, for justice, or for humanity, every where spreading devastation and ruin?

"And who are they who do these things? Men who do not blush to pretend, with the most impudent effrontery, that they wish to bestow liberty upon the Church, and to restore a moral sense to Italy. More than all this, they are not ashamed to ask the

Roman Pontiff to consent to acquiesce in their unjust desires, lest greater evil should redound to the Church.

"But that which causes us the greatest grief, venerable brethren, is, that several members of the secular and regular clergy, some of whom were even invested with ecclesiastical dignities, miserably hurried away by a fatal spirit of error and rebellion, and forgetful of their vocation and their duties, have strayed from the path of truth, have given their consent to the designs of the impious, and, to the great regret of good men, have become a stumbling-block and a scandal.

"Yet, in the midst of this pain, which we should never have been able to bear without God's especial support, it is a consolation to us to behold the virtue and courage of the Bishops of Italy, and of the whole Catholic world. These venerable brethren, attached to us and the See of Peter by the closest ties of faith, charity, and reverence, unintimidated by any peril, and fulfilling their ministry to the immortal honour of their name and of their order, cease not to defend intrepidly the cause of God, of His holy Church, and of this Apostolic See, its rights, its doctrine, and the cause of justice and of humanity. They cease not to watch most carefully over the soundness of their flock, refuting the false and erroneous doctrines of the enemy, and bravely resisting their impious efforts. We feel a joy not less great in seeing how the faithful priests and populations of Italy, and of all Christendom, tread in the footsteps of their prelates, and pride themselves more and more on publicly manifesting towards us and this Apostolic See their love and their respect, by defending our most holy religion. And as their clergy and the faithful take the liveliest interest in the extreme embarrassment which has been caused to us by the spoliation of the greater part of our temporal dominions, they believe that nothing is more meritorious for them than to lighten, by their pious and spontaneous gifts, those very grave embarrassments.

"While we render thanks to God, who deigns, in this generosity of the episcopacy and of the faithful, to give us consolation and strength amid our sorrows, we also express anew,

before the world, our sentiments of profound gratitude, since it is exclusively by their help that we are able to support the great and increasing charges of this Holy See.

"Here, venerable brethren, we know not how to pass in silence the constant evidence of real affection, of unalterable fidelity, which the Roman people have lavished towards us. Desirous of giving striking proof of the tenacity with which it firmly holds itself attached to us, to this Apostolic See, and to this temporal sovereignty which belongs to us, it repels and condemns with the greatest energy the culpable intrigues and endeavours of those who seek to lay snares in its path, and to spread trouble in its bosom. Have not you yourselves, venerable brethren, witnessed, over and over again, the sincere, undisguised, and cordial manifestations by which this Roman people, which we so much love, has

displayed its sentiments of traditional faith, a faith which deservedly merits the greatest praise?

"Now, as we have the divine promise that our Lord will be with His Church until the consummation of the world, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, we are assured that God will not break His word, and that a day will come, a day of wonders, when God will show that this formidable tempest has not been raised to submerge the bark of the Church, but rather to bear it up the higher."

Here the Pope seems to imply that he will not consent to any transaction with a revolution which has pursued an end that is against the interests of the Church, by means so atrociously unjust to her ministers and her religious. Such is the present aspect of the Roman question.

* * * The article on "The Education Commission" was inadvertently placed among the "Editorial" articles. It was intended to stand in the "Communicated" division.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

THE Conductors of the RAMBLER having found it necessary to change their Publishers, think it right to state that they contemplate no further alteration in their existing arrangements. They profess no other object in their labours than that which has been the animating principle of the Magazine hitherto, viz. to coöperate with Catholic periodicals of higher pretensions in a work of especial importance in the present day,—the refinement, enlargement, and elevation of the intellect in the educated classes.

It will be their aim, as it has ever been, to combine devotion to the Church with discrimination and candour in the treatment of her opponents ; to reconcile freedom of thought with implicit faith ; to discountenance what is untenable and unreal, without forgetting the tenderness due to the weak and the reverence rightly claimed for what is sacred ; and to encourage a manly investigation of subjects of public interest under a deep sense of the prerogatives of ecclesiastical authority.

The contents of the Magazine are disposed under the five heads of editorial articles, communicated articles, correspondence, current literature, and current events.

As regards the opinions and representations advanced under the second and third heads, only such general responsibility is undertaken by its Conductors as is involved in their being parties to the publication ; and for this reason admission will readily be granted to articles, otherwise eligible, which take a contrary view, or even make those opinions the object of their remark. All controversy will be conducted under anonymous signatures.

As to the correspondence, it is believed that, besides its other uses, that department of the Magazine will afford opportunity, if discreetly conducted, for the profitable discussion and explanation of various matters, historical, ecclesiastical, political, and the like, about which individuals may feel interest or perplexity.

In the notices of current literature, it is not contemplated to in-

clude either theological or devotional works : not dogmatic subjects, because they ought to be treated with more reverence and fullness than is possible in a Magazine ; nor devotional, because they appeal to the feelings, tastes, and needs of individual religious minds, which cannot be made the subject of criticism or of science.

The Conductors of the RAMBLER indulge the hope that the zeal and labour expended on it in former years have not been without fruit ; and, under the encouragement thereby given them, they recommend its future to the good prayers of those persons, not few, they trust, nor inconsiderable, who are interested in its well-being.

*** Communications must be addressed, post-paid, to MESSRS. WILLIAMS and NORGATE, 14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C. ; and no Communications can be returned.*